THE

UNITED STATES

CATHOLIC MAGAZINE

AND MONTHLY REVIEW.

JUNE, 1846.

BRAZIL AND THE BRAZILIANS.

Sketches of Residence and Travel in Brazil, *embracing Historical and Geographical notices of the empire and its several provinces.* By Daniel P. Kidder. In two volumes, with illustrations. Philadelphia: Sorin & Ball. London: Wiley & Putnam. 1845.

EW countries are more interesting than Brazil; concerning few are the sources of information which are accessible to the American reader more shallow and unsatisfactory. Mr. Kidder has attempted, and with some success, to supply a great deficiency of which we, in common with many others, have long been deeply sensible. The very name *Brazil* calls up agreeble and poetic associations. It tells of a country of beautiful rivers and magnificent harbors, of splendid cities and cheerful people, of lovely flowers and smiling valleys, of rare plants and gigantic vegetation, of warm sunshine and warmer hearts. We confess that from our boyhood up we have always thought of the El Dorado whenever we heard the name of Brazil uttered; and, even now, there is no place in the new world we would be more delighted to see than Rio de Janeiro.

To be able to judge of a country correctly, a man should be almost more than human. If he should not have dropped down from the clouds, he should at least divest himself of all narrow prejudice, and become a citizen of the world in the most enlarged sense of the term, ere he can rightly appreciate the character of a strange people. Unless his heart be as wide as the world, he will be but too apt to judge the new people among whom he may travel by the contracted views which he formed when under his father's roof or while breathing the air of his native hills or valleys. To love our own country above all others, and to think its people greater and better and happier than any other, is a feeling natural to the human bosom, which may be either a virtue, or at most a very excusable weakness; but

to push this sentiment so far as to conceive a contempt for all other nations whose people do not exactly agree with us in constitutional temperament or social life, in legislation or religion, is certainly something more than a mere infirmity. It is an evidence of silly pride and narrow-minded prejudice. The traveller in foreign lands should surely leave all such ideas at home; at least, if he take it into his head to write a book, he should not inflict his own contracted and erroneous views on his readers, who look more for agreeable narrative and solid information, than for the peculiar notions or first impressions of the writer.

And yet how difficult it is to get rid of this narrow prejudice; and to become really a citizen of the world! How difficult to institute an impartial comparison between our own people and those of other nations whom we consider less favored! How apt we are to look only at the dark side of the picture in a strange land, and to compare it with the bright side of that in our own dear country! Though extensive travel tends to expand our ideas and to liberalize our views, yet there are some men whose views and notions are never expanded; and who, for all the good travelling does them or others, might as well stay at home.

We are not inclined to set down Mr. Kidder in this class of unteachable travellers, except where the religion of Brazil was opposed to his own settled prejudices. We have read his Sketches with great interest and pleasure, and we really believe that, with the exception just indicated, he sought to be impartial and accurate in his statements. We are indebted to him for much valuable information on the present political and financial condition of the Brazilian empire; as well as for an interesting synopsis of its past history, and a pretty fair estimate of its population, resources, literary and charitable establishments, great men, and future prospects. We are the more grateful for all this as we had never before seen any work on Brazil in which the attempt to portray the institutions of the country had been so full and successful.

Yet we much regret to say that Mr. Kidder's work is often greatly disfigured by religious prejudice, and not unfrequently marred by positive misrepresentation. We could not, of course, have expected that, being a Protestant, he would have written as a Catholic; but we certainly had a right to expect that one so well informed and so liberal on other things would not have betrayed so much ignorance and bigotry in regard to the Catholic religion. And it will be our duty, as religious reviewers, to notice some of the more striking among these exhibitions of an illiberal spirit. In discharging this office we intend "not to set down aught in malice," but, at the same time, to speak plainly whenever the subject may seem to require it. We are heartily tired of being compelled every day to expose misrepresentations of our religion made by men who should have known better, and who can plead no excuse whatever for their ignorance or malice. The doctrines and practices of Catholicity are not hidden in a corner; they are not of yesterday; they have been boldly and unequivocally set forth to the whole world for eighteen long centuries, during fifteen of which those sectarians who now think proper to cover them with obloquy had not yet sprung into existence!

Mr. Kidder went to Brazil with his religious notions already formed, and with a predetermination not to be pleased by any thing not conformable to them. He went with a settled conviction that the Brazilians were sitting "in the region of the shadow of death," and that it would be a great mercy to endeavor to shed some light on their darkness. He went as a *hired* agent of the Methodist Episcopal Missionary Society, for the purpose of distributing Bibles and tracts among the benighted papists of Brazil; and, of course, it was his obvious *interest* to represent them as ignorant, as priest-rid-

den, as dark on the subject of the Bible as possible. Perhaps, upon the coloring of his picture depended the amount of his salary, and the chance of another outfit. We are quite confident we are doing him no injustice; we have travelled ourselves in Catholic countries; we have had for several years full opportunities of comparing what *we knew* to be the truth with the false or miserably perverted statements of those very men of God who belong to Mr. Kidder's school; and we have come to the deliberate conclusion that little or no reliance is to be placed on the statements of any among them all, at least whenever the Catholic religion is concerned. The notable "Memoranda of Foreign Travel" by the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, the "Letters of Rev. Mr. Cheever," and the "Sketches of Brazil,"—to say nothing of a hundred other books of the same kind with which our country is literally flooded,—are, all of them, little better than base libels on the religious character of the people among whom those reverend missionaries temporarily sojourned.

This is so notoriously true, that we confess we are greatly and very agreeably disappointed whenever these reverend men of God vouchsafe to tell even a portion of the truth about our religious brethren in other lands. If such "no-popery" zealots will not stick at telling the most glaring untruths and lending their sanction to the most outrageous forgeries and impostures under our very eyes, and for the purpose of ruining our character at home;* what will they not do when they go abroad, and tell us wonderful stories about Catholics, the scene of which is laid thousands of miles off? If they will indulge in slander with the fear of almost instant detection and exposure staring them in the face, what will they not do when the danger of detection is less imminent? "If they do these things in the green wood, what will they not do in the dry?" Besides, they know full well that whatever they may state against Catholics in foreign climes will go unchallenged among the vast majority of their readers; and that, in fact, the more strongly tinctured their books will be with the "no-popery" spirit, the more spicy they will be considered, and the better they will sell. Thus they have every human motive to bear false witness against their neighbors; they please their employers, and thereby get a better salary and perhaps a new appointment; they please their co-religionists, and thereby extend their reputation and influence; they please their readers, and thereby make more money by their book. Money, money, money: the beginning, the middle, the end—the very life and soul—of all modern Protestant missionary enterprise! Yes, we repeat it; we know these holy missionaries well; and even their own people are beginning to find them out.

But, after all, these devout emissaries do some good, not only to themselves, but incidentally at least to others. They encourage the publishers, and they spread out among the people some wholesome knowledge, cumbered though it be with much misrepresentation and prejudice. The truth sometimes peeps out from their pages almost in spite of them; and they not unfrequently, in the most simple and good-natured manner imaginable, let out the secret of their own utter failure in the holy enterprise upon which they had embarked, with a good round sum for an outfit, and high annual wages to console them in their labors. We shall see that Mr. Kidder does this; but before we come to this feature in his book, we must spread out before our readers some of the glaring evidences of his ignorance and prejudice in regard to the religion of the Brazilians. We might criticise his style, which is often very loose and careless; we might take exception to his taste in treating his readers, in season and out of season, to scraps of Portuguese, when English would have suited them much bet-

*Look at the Maria Monk and other similar impostures.

ter, and served his purpose fully as well; we might find fault with him for relying so implicitly on that hireling historian "laureate" of falsehood, whenever Catholicity is concerned—Robert Southey: but we really can not pause to go into all these minutiæ. We must enter at once upon the graver matter of making good the charge preferred against him above—of having borne false witness against the Brazilians on the subject of religion.

He deliberately repeats the silly and exploded falsehood, that the Brazilian Catholics are in the habit of *adoring* images! Thus he says, speaking of what he saw in the convent of San Antonio at Rio: "The *adoration* of images was, *of course*, a prominent topic of remark."* "Of course," it was. Had not his grandmother told him, while he was yet in the nursery, that *all Catholics adore* images? and was not the mere presence of images in Catholic churches sufficient evidence to *his* mind to confirm this grave accusation? "Of course" it was! How could Catholics be supposed to have common sense enough to distinguish between a bit of canvass or a piece of marble and the living God of heaven and earth? Shade of Raphael! how you would stand aghast at the prodigious acumen and taste of this modern saint. Had he but invoked you, he might have received some information as to the emblematic meaning of those streams of blood issuing from the five sacred wounds of the Saviour, and descending "to a figure beneath, in the posture of devotion," which he saw represented in a painting in the same convent, and the explanation of which, he says, none of the good monks could give him!† Probably they thought him an unfit subject for instruction, or they smiled at his ignorance, and were too polite to undeceive him; else they might have told him that those streams indicated the saving influence of the blood of Christ on the fervent Christian. Had he possessed but a very moderate share of penetration, he might have found out this of himself without the trouble of asking; and he might also have known that St. Benedict is in some places really held as, and not merely "jocosely denominated," the patron of negroes, as he appears to have apprehended the matter.*

A very moderate acquaintance with the Catholic Catechism and Church Calendar would have prevented him from exposing his ignorance on many other points, in which a Catholic child of ten years could have set him right. Thus he says, in the first volume, that mass was celebrated during the hours of the evening;† and he had not grown a whit wiser when he reached the middle of the second, for he there made the startling discovery that a Catholic "novena is *a service of nine masses* performed on as many successive days," and very late in the evening too, as the sequel of the passage shows!!‡ The veriest old woman in Brazil could have told him that mass is universally celebrated in the morning, and generally at a very early hour, as the officiating clergyman must be fasting; and we venture to say that, if his Sketches should ever be republished in Brazil, all the Brazilian women and children would indulge in a hearty and good natured laugh at his expense, for having supposed the mass and evening devotions of the Lenten season identical; and the laugh would have grown louder and merrier when they would have found out that our traveller actually identified the mass with the popular festivals celebrated by the people in some localities with fire rockets, illuminations, and other demonstrations amid the thickening darkness of the evening!! Mr. Kidder would really do well to study our religion, at least a little, before he undertakes again to travesty its worship and to caricature its observances: he should do this, even if it were only for his own sake, and to avoid making himself ridiculous.

By the way, his nerves were dread-

* Vol. i, 186. † Vol. i, 187.

* Ibid. † Vol. i, 123. ‡ Vol. ii, 184-5.

fully shocked by the sound of those same fire rockets let off in a popular festival, probably of the patron saint, at Parahiba; and,—oh! horrible desecration! on the evening of the Sabbath day! We will present an extract for the double purpose of making our readers acquainted with the author's exquisitely delicate feelings on the subject, and of laying before them his description of certain popular sports which the church authorities have thought proper to tolerate in connection with religious festivals in certain parts of Spanish and Portuguese America, to which we believe they are peculiar.

"I was induced to walk out in the evening to witness what was thought could not fail to be deeply interesting. The Matriz church, at which the fête was held, was situated near by. It stood at one end of an oblong area. Its front was illuminated by candles hung in broken lanterns around the door, and burning before an image in a nich attached to the cupola. Large fires were blazing in different parts of the area. Around them were groups of blacks, eager to fire off volleys of rockets at appropriate parts of the service that was going on within the church. After the novena was finished, all the people sallied out into the campo to witness the fire-works. These commenced about nine o'clock, and continued, I was told, till after midnight. . . . . One of the most painful impressions of the scene arose from seeing whole families, including mothers and their daughters, out in the damp air to gaze upon spectacles not only partaking of the most low and vulgar species of the ludicrous, but having a decidedly immoral tendency—and all this under the name of religion! I was glad to retire as early as those who accompanied me would consent to go, resolving never again voluntarily to witness such profanations of the Sabbath.*

The godly man! We almost fancy that we see him retiring in disgust from the vulgar crowd of publicans and sinners assembled to amuse themselves with fire-works on a popular feast-day after the religious services were over in the church, and hastening to his chamber, there to raise his pure eyes and hands to heaven, "to thank God that he is not like the rest of men," and "to resolve never again *voluntarily (!)* to witness such desecrations of the Sabbath; that is, we suppose, unless some ungodly Brazilian papist should take it into his head to drag the reverend man to the scene of the festival, and to have his eyes propped wide open, so that he could not avoid looking on such popish abominations; then indeed it would be an *involuntary* act, and there would be no remedy except in submitting or dying a martyr, which alternative seldom falls to the lot of our *enlightened* modern missionary! And so it was a profanation of the Sabbath to fire off rockets on that holy day—though there is no Scripture against it that we know of—and it was no profanation to turn Pharisee on that day, to sneer at the neighbor, and worse still, to slander his religious character! How some people will "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel!" Now we do not like any profanation of the Sunday or Lord's day,—very pharisaically called the *Sabbath*, though the Jewish Sabbath has long since been done away with,—we love to see it kept holy as much as our brethren; but we can not, for the life of us, see why our faces should be particularly lengthened on that day, or why we should grow sadder. Is it not a day of rest from toil, and also a day of rejoicing for the resurrection of our Lord? We confess we are not at all partial to fire-works on the Sunday, and they are certainly no part of our worship, nor is their use at all general in Catholic countries; but we are free to avow the conviction, based upon a careful examination of *both* sides of the question, that where all popular amusements are suppressed, and the pall of death is spread over the people on Sunday, there is really less piety and more vice than where some innocent popular sports are tolerated, purified and elevated by religion. How does a very great portion of our own population in this great Bible land spend the Sunday? Do one half go to church on that day? Are the coffee houses, taverns, and gambling establishments (!) empty? We rather

* Vol. ii, 185-6.

think not. And how do some of our holiest people spend their Sunday evenings? Are unworthy gossip and foul slander of their neighbors not among their ordinary amusements? We opine that these are much worse than even fire-works. How we do detest and abhor the hollow hypocrisy and canting pharisaism of the day! Rather place our lot with the publicans and sinners who shoot crackers on Sunday than with such *saints* as these!

We could not, of course, expect that a man so spiritual and so enlightened as Mr. Kidder should at all relish the Catholic ceremonial, or be impressed with its splendor and dramatic effect, especially during the holy week. To be sure, that magnificent worship has riveted the attention and excited the admiration of the greatest men of every age for long centuries back, without any distinction of creed or country; but the genius of our missionary throws all those great personages in the shade, and sets them down in the vulgar herd of the untasty and unenlightened. *He* would be much too holy, perhaps, to admire the *Miserere* of the Sixtine chapel, the chant of the Lamentations, or the *Stabat Mater* of Rossini,—services which have long drawn tears from the eyes even of men whose hearts were steeled with prejudice against Catholicity. But what were *they* to Mr. Kidder! Listen to his closing remarks on the religious ceremonies of Rio during the holy week and other great festivals, which, he intimates in another place, are almost as splendid as those of Rome itself:

"Amid the noise and confusion, the mirth and the parade of all these 'glorious,' 'splendid,' and 'pompous' celebrations, he must be a singularly devout man who can find any room for spiritual worship, not to say any incitement to it."*

He does not think proper to tell us whether he was one of those singularly devout men, who could be "spiritual," in spite of all these carnal works, but he leaves us to *guess* it out for ourselves, though it requires no great shrewdness in the art to know which way he would wish us to think. Well, to oblige him, we will allow that he was eminently spiritual and eminently unimpressible, as well as a shrewd reckoner in matters of dollars and cents. He is almost as much shocked at the *expense* of these religious services, as he was at the fire-works. How stupid those popish Brazilians for not having given to him for his Bibles the large amounts they yearly expended to decorate their splendid churches, and to keep up their grand ceremonial. The money would then, at least, have been of some use to him; and it would have created quite a sensation in his—pockets, in which, by the by, Protestant missionaries are wont to feel most sensitively. How he would have liked to change slightly the wording of the following passage, which he quotes with implied censure from a discourse or report made by the president of a Brazilian province!

"It is a matter of the very first necessity to put in proper repair our mother churches, and to give *all possible splendor to divine worship*,* not merely as a duty, but as a means of giving the sublime principles of religion more influence over the imagination, over the public morals, and consequently over the happiness of the state."†

To the honor of the Brazilians be it said that they are a singularly religious people, even according to the showing of our prejudiced author. Their churches are beautiful and often splendidly decorated; their minds and hearts lead them to religious observances; and even their sports are interwoven with religion. You will see religious emblems and the sacred cross every where,—in churches, in convents, in the streets, on the public highways. The names of towns, rivers, and provinces are often religious. Mr. Kidder is scandalized at this system of nomenclature. He would greatly prefer the old pagan names of the aborigines to these names of saints;‡ he says it would be in decidedly better taste:

* Vol. i, 156.

* The italics are his. †Vol. i, 144. ‡Vol. i, 264.

he means, of course, that it would be more in accordance with *his* taste, and he certainly ought to know. We will not quarrel with him for this; if his tastes are more pagan than Christian, be it so; he may be for all this the better qualified to be a missionary among the Brazilians.

He would have done much better, however, had he kept his ignorance to himself when he asked a Brazilian to tell him what was meant by the festival of *Nossa Senhora des Neves*, or our Lady of the Snow;* for had he but opened the first prayer-book he met with, he would have discovered that this festival occurs on the 5th of August, is one of the most remarkable and well known in the year, and is in commemoration of the snow which, according to a very old and respectable tradition, fell in Rome on that day to designate the site of the old Liberian basilic, now St. Mary Majors. Again, had he calculated less upon the credulity of his readers, he would not probably have insulted their understandings with the nonsensical account of the manner in which the ants were once excommunicated in Brazil, which account he copies, as he does much other similar stuff, from that veracious court hireling, Southey!† And had he taken a few elementary lessons in Catholicity from some old lady in Brazil, he would probably have understood something about the meaning of the ceremonies used in Catholic baptism, and he would not have indulged in the gross ribaldry which disgraces his account of a baptism at Rio.‡ Finally, had he only reflected that, in the matter of stabbings and homicides, we free citizens of this glorious republic have made about as much progress as any of our neighbors even in Spanish America, we would probably have been spared his comments on the murderous disposition of the people in a certain province of Brazil;§ for he might have apprehended a retort which would have forcibly reminded him of the old proverb about throwing stones at others.

*Vol. ii, 184. †Vol. i, 266. ‡Ib. 173. §Vol. ii, 188.

Mr. Kidder's mission to Brazil, as we have already seen, was to distribute Bibles and tracts among the benighted papists of that empire. What success attended his enterprise for the conversion of the natives thereabouts, we shall see presently. He certainly succeeded, to some extent, in scattering Bibles and tracts over the country; and we need not be surprised at this, when we reflect that he often made the distribution with very little discrimination. Thus he gave a tract to a man whom he afterwards discovered to be an arrant thief;* and another to a boy who could not read a syllable.† This boy, by the way, must have been a particularly bright youth, and our author accordingly treats us to a conversation which he had with him. As he appears to present him as a sort of specimen of the Brazilian lads in general, we will quote the conference, which our readers will find interesting and conclusive enough.

"Have you any school in this vicinity?
Yes, one.
Where is it?
In the palace.
How many attend it?
Don't know; about three benches full.
Do you go at present?
No; I finished last year.
Do you know how to write?
No, nor to read either.
What then did you learn at school?
Nada! nothing at all!"‡

Now this reminds us of a conversation we once had with a very bright youth whom we met, not in Brazil nor in any other "popish" country, but in this our own glorious native land of freedom and of open Bibles. The lad looked to be about thirteen years old; and after the preliminary civilities were over, we ventured to ask him: "My good boy, what is your name?" He opened his eyes and mouth very wide, as if the question had puzzled him not a little, and, after having duly scratched his head, probably to set his ideas in motion, he answered in these identical words: "*I ha'nt got no name;*

* Vol. i, 168. † Vol. ii, 181. ‡ Ibid.

but they's gwine to call me Jim Russell!" We were not a little amused at the adventure, but we never once dreamed of giving *him* as a specimen of our youth; and had we had a bushel of tracts, we should probably have thought it premature to entrust one to his keeping! And yet it is out of such materials as this that our *hired* travelling missionaries in "popish" countries manufacture the most touching portions of their books!

Our author, however, indiscreetly lets out the secret that in distributing Bibles he often had an eye to business. Does the following extract imply that he sometimes paid his travelling bills, including various little contingent expenses on the way, by means of his Bibles, Testaments, and tracts? If so, he knew what he was about, and could save a penny as well as any one else down east.

"I had brought with me a quantity of tracts and Scriptures. Experience, however, had taught me that an indiscriminate distribution was not the best method of putting them into circulation. My method, therefore, was to bestow what I had to give, *as a recompense for favors I had received, or as an obligation to secure something that I requested*, at the same time explaining the great advantages to be derived from a proper use of the *gifts* bestowed (!). Thus I naturally presented a Testament to the heads of each of the families to which I had been introduced,"* &c.

We have read with great interest whatever Mr. Kidder says in reference to the distribution of the Bible in Brazil; and we will here present some reflections which struck us with force at the time we were perusing his "Sketches." Of course, when he makes an admission against himself, especially in connection with his darling scheme of scattering the Bible over the country, the reader will see it was wrested from him by the most stubborn evidence of truth alone; and he will be even inclined to suspect that there was probably something more than he cared to acknowledge. It is hard for a man—even for as holy a one as our author—to admit a thing which makes against a favorite theory closely connected with his own interest.

He admits that Bibles were sometimes met with even in "popish" and benighted Brazil! Thus he fell in with a military captain, near Olinda, who informed him "that Bibles were sometimes met with in his vicinity, and that he had one in his family."* And this, be it remembered, was far away in the interior of Brazil. Thus, also—would you believe it, gentle reader?—he actually found that Bible extracts were used in the public schools at San Paulo† for the purpose of teaching the children to read. Speaking of this school, he says:

"The school was decidedly the most flourishing that I saw in the empire. It registered one hundred and fifty-six as scholars, most of whom were white, but a sprinkling (!) of mulattoes and colored lads among them gave variety to the appearance of the company. The several classes answered the questions addressed to them in a sprightly and intelligent manner, giving evidence of good improvement. The Lancasterian system was in full operation; but the most pleasing circumstance I noticed was that cards, *exhibiting extracts from Scripture, were used in teaching the children to read. Very appropriate lessons had been selected*, according to the capacity of the little readers, and could not fail to exert a most happy influence over their heart as well as mind."‡

To the same effect is his admission that the Bible was not excluded from at least one of the principal colleges of Rio Janeiro. Speaking of one of its public exercises, he says:

"When all were appropriately seated, the director opened the exercises of the day by standing up and *reading from the Bible* five verses of the eighteenth chapter of Matthew. Then passing the Bible into the hands of the monitor general, the company were invited to kneel, while the monitor recited the prayers of Solomon at the dedication of the temple. 1 *Kings* viii, 23–54."§

* Vol. ii, 173.

* Vol. ii, 208.

† One of the principal cities of Brazil, and the capital of the province of the same name.

‡ Vol. i, 302. § Vol. i, 173.

Nay, more; he makes the painful avowal that, after all that has been said by the "no-popery" zealots about the opposition to the circulation of the Bible in the vernacular tongues by Catholic countries in general, and by South America in particular, the Bible was never proscribed in Brazil! True, he qualifies the admission in various ways; he seems to writhe with agony while making it, as if he feared to hurt the feelings of his employers, and to scandalize his dear readers; he wraps it up in an envelope of ambiguous, we had almost said, disingenuous language; but it is still there, clearly put down in his book.

"In fact, *although the Bible had never been proscribed in Brazil*, otherwise than in the usual regulations of the Romish church (!!), yet in the lack of all effort on the part of the priesthood to give it currency, it was, so far as the vulgar tongue was concerned, an effectually concealed and unknown book. .... But Portugal had never published the Bible, or countenanced its circulation, save in connection with notes and comments that had been approved by inquisitorial censorship!"*

That is, plainly, the Bible in the vulgar tongue *never was proscribed in Brazil;* and even Portugal, the mother country, published it, and countenanced its circulation, provided it had some approved explanatory notes annexed. The Catholic discipline requires this latter condition, lest, as St. Peter warns us, "the unlearned and the unstable (the bulk of mankind) should wrest it to their own perdition," as those very Bible men do, by extracting from it a thousand contradictory systems, quarrelling continually about its meaning, and then boasting of their love of it, and sneering at that venerable church from whose hands they originally received it, and which alone has been always uniform and consistent in its interpretation! As to the "regulations of the Romish church," and the "inquisitorial censorship," it is all false or unmeaning verbiage—nothing more. Do not our Bible and tract societies exercise an "inquisitorial censorship" over the works they publish, the Bible itself not excepted? Did they not *expurgate* D'Aubigné's Reformation, and when a clamor was raised among their own co-religionists about that *expurgation*, did they not acknowledge that they were *in the habit* of serving most of the works they published in the same manner? Do they not continually put in requisition their "inquisitorial censorship" in deciding upon what version of the Bible they should print; and have not the Baptists threatened to leave, or actually left them, because they would not publish translations to suit the peculiar views of their sect? Yea, more; did not this same Bible society, some years ago, publish a Spanish Bible with a glaring forgery and falsehood on its title-page, which stated that it was a reprint of an old and approved Catholic version, whereas it omitted entirely several books which the "inquisitors" chose to consider apocryphal? And yet these men prate about "Romish regulations" and "inquisitorial censorship!" How we do hate hypocrisy!

We do not know precisely what translation of the Old Testament Mr. Kidder sought to distribute among the Brazilians; whether it was a Catholic or a Protestant one; or whether, like the Spanish Bible just spoken of, it had a Catholic title-page and Protestant contents. Upon the translation of the New Testament he is more explicit; it purported to be a reprint of that rendered from the Latin vulgate by the Padre Antonio Pereira de Figueiredo, a standard orthodox version in Portugal. Mr. Kidder tells us that, "through some slanders circulated by an English Catholic priest residing at Rio, the suspicions of the old bishop were excited lest the translation was not actually what it purported to be, but had suffered alterations."* He adds, indeed, that "an examination was proposed,"—by whom he is too cautious to state,—"but that either

* Vol. i, 137.

* Vol. i, 326.

through inability, or wilful neglect, it was not attempted." Very possibly the examination was challenged by the bishop of Rio, at the instance of the English Catholic priest, who was, no doubt, well acquainted with the pious frauds so frequently practised by those godly Bible societies, and thought it a duty to guard the unsuspecting Brazilians against them, or perhaps the bishop's mind was satisfied on the subject without a formal or public examination. We really would have been glad if our missionary had deemed it prudent to be a little more explicit on this matter.

One thing is, however, remarkable, that notwithstanding the well grounded suspicions just alluded to, Mr. Kidder met with very little opposition, either from the clergy or the people, in his attempt to circulate the Bible in Brazil. If we are to believe his own account, he was strongly encouraged in his enterprise by some of the first men in the country, including several Catholic priests. He was even imboldened to make a formal proposition on the subject, in the name of the New York Bible society, to the provincial government of San Paulo, and his proposals were received with great consideration; and, though never definitively acted upon, were yet advocated by some of the leading politicians of the province.* These facts may serve to show us that, after all, the Brazilian Catholics are not so much opposed to the circulation of the Scriptures in the vernacular as some of our opponents would seem to imagine. Mr. Kidder himself bears ample testimony to the liberality and religious toleration of the Brazilians.

"Yet the Brazilians," he says, "on their political disenthralment, adopted a liberal and tolerant constitution. Although it made the Roman Catholic apostolic religion that of the state, *yet it allowed all other forms of religion to be held and practised*, save in buildings 'having the exterior form of a temple.' It also forbade persecution on the ground of religious opinions."†

* Vol. i, 323 seqq. † Vol. 137-8.

In another place he tells us:

"It is my firm conviction that there is not a Roman Catholic country on the face of the globe where there prevails a greater degree of toleration, or a greater liberality of feeling towards Protestants."*

After these avowals from an open enemy, it will scarcely do for our "anti-popery" preachers to continue ringing in our ears the old cry of Catholics being priest-ridden in Catholic countries, or of "popish" intolerance and bigotry. They had better first remove the stain from their own character, and acquire themselves a more liberal and charitable spirit, before they indulge in tirades so unjust against their neighbors.

Mr. Kidder also often speaks in terms of high eulogy of the Catholic clergy whom he met with in his travels, and he does not say much about their immorality, upon which we suppose he would have dilated at great length had he had the slightest grounds for so doing. Though he was known as an agent of a foreign Bible society, yet he was every where received with politeness, sometimes with marked kindness, by the Catholic clergy.

"At one of those places," he says, "the individual to whom I was thus addressed, and by whom I was entertained, was a Roman Catholic priest;† and it affords me unfeigned satisfaction to say that the hospitality which I received under his roof was just what the stranger in a strange land would desire."‡

The following tribute to Brazilian politeness and affability is enhanced by the well merited hit at the churlishness we often meet with in this "glorious Protestant land of open Bibles."

"Within these coaches might be witnessed perfect specimens of Brazilian manners. A person accustomed to the distant and care-for-no-one airs which are generally observed in the New York stages, might be a little surprised that so much friendly attention and politeness could prevail among perfect strangers, who might happen to meet each other in these vehicles. It might be equally sur-

* Vol. i, 143.

† By a singular piece of legerdemain he transforms this *priest* into a *deacon* two pages farther on! ‡ Vol. i, 313.

prising to see that no one was excluded on account of color. Condition is the test of respectability in Brazil."*

There is a much stronger reason for this affability and politeness so universal in Catholic countries than many would be inclined to suspect; and the same reason explains the comparative coldness and selfishness of most Protestant countries. The Catholic religion is eminently *social* in its character; it draws people together; it merges the individual in the social feelings. Protestantism, on the contrary, is a system strongly antisocial in its tendency; it sets up every man for himself; it merges the social in the individual feelings; it leads to isolation, to selfishness. Our word for it, there is not current in Brazil nor in any other Catholic country any such selfish proverb as that which is, more or less, common among us: "EVERY MAN FOR HIMSELF, AND GOD FOR US ALL." Such a sentiment would be impossible in Catholic society.

Brazil is, we believe, the only country in South America where slavery exists; and our author admits that there Catholicity often softens the hard lot of the slave by infusing kindness and charity into the heart of the master or mistress. He furnishes us with the following picture of a very rich and pious Catholic widow who lived near Rio.

"On the other side of us lived a Portuguese widow, advanced in life, also surrounded with a house full of slaves. She was a model of amiability, if not of piety. She treated her slaves as tenderly as though they had been her own children, and was specially punctilious in calling them together at vespers, and causing them to say their pater nosters, and chant a litany of moderate length. So well trained were they to this exercise that their voices would not have done discredit to the music of some of the churches."†

We would be indeed curious to learn whether any of our southern planters who own a large number of slaves ever exhibit so much care for their spiritual improvement, or whether any of them all keeps a chaplain expressly for their benefit. This is often the case in Brazil, where people still entertain the strange old "popish" idea that a master is bound to care somewhat for the *souls* as well as for the *bodies* of his servants. Here is the testimony of our missionary on what he saw at an extensive manufactory some distance from S. Paulo, and we commend it to the attention of our own enlightened citizens, whether manufacturers or planters:

"In the course of the evening, half an hour was devoted to vespers. I had observed a great number of the slaves entering, who in succession addressed us with crossed hands, and the pious salutation,—*'Seja louvado Nosso Senhor Jesus Christo,'*—blessed be the (our?) Lord Jesus Christ. Presently there commenced a chant in the adjoining room, when the padre who sat by my side, rising, said he supposed I did not pray, but that he was going to do so. I corrected his mistake, and he went out laughing, without, however, inviting any of us to accompany him. I was told that he attended these exercises merely as any other member of the family—the singing and prayers being taught and conducted by an aged black man. The devotions of the evening consisted chiefly of a *novena*. It was really pleasant to hear the sound of a hundred voices mingling in this their chief religious exercise and privilege. This assembling the slaves, generally at evening, and sometimes both morning and evening, is said *to be common on plantations in the country*, and is not unfrequent among domestics in the cities. *Mistress and servant at these times meet on a level.* The pleasures afforded the latter by such opportunities, in connection with the numerous holydays enjoined by the Roman Catholic religion, form certainly a great mitigation of the hard lot of servitude!"*

One would almost feel inclined to think that our zealous missionaries who move heaven and earth to make proselytes to their new-fangled notions, instead of going out to distant Catholic lands to unsettle the long cherished religious belief of the people, would do much better to stay at home, and to labor for the reformation of their own brethren by introducing amongst

* Vol. i, 161. † Vol. i, 159-60.

* Vol. i, 246-7.

them the above, and many other similar religious and social improvements, which, to their shame be it said, are almost peculiar to Catholic lands. Perhaps these domestic missions would not be attended with so much *eclat*, nor turn out *so profitable* to those concerned in them! Among the ameliorations we allude to, they might introduce with great advantage the *Irmandades*, or charitable brotherhoods, so abundant in Catholic countries, and no where more common than in Brazil. Our author devotes an entire chapter* to these brotherhoods, and to other charities of Rio; and our only regret is that our narrow limits will not allow us to present copious extracts from his extended account of them. Yet we must quote a few pages.

"The brotherhoods contribute to the erection and support of churches, provide for the sick, bury the dead, and support masses for souls. In short, next after the state, they are the most efficient auxiliaries for supporting the religious establishment of the country. Many of them, in the lapse of years, have become rich by the receipt of donations and legacies, and membership in such is highly prized."*

"The most extensive hospital in the city is that called the Santa Casa da Misericordia, or the Holy House of Mercy. This establishment is located on the sea shore, under the brow of the Castello hill, and is open day and night for the reception of the sick and distressed. The best assistance in the power of the administration to give, is here rendered to all, male or female, black or white, Moor or Christian,—none of whom, even the most wretched, are under the necessity of seeking influence or recommendations in order to be received. From the statistics of this establishment, it appears that more than five thousand patients are annually received, of whom more than one thousand die. . . . In this hospital are treated *vast numbers of English and American seamen*, the subjects of sickness or accident on their arrival, or during their stay in the port. Indeed there are few nations of the world which are not represented among the inmates of the Misericordia of Rio Janeiro. . . . . The benevolence of this house is not confined to those within its infirmaries, but extends to the different prisons of the city, most of whose inmates receive food and medicine from the provisions of the Misericordia."*

This is truly a Catholic charity, well worthy of our admiration and imitation. Mr. Kidder does not tell us that there was organized at Rio a "native" party, the chief staple of whose tactics was the abuse of those "vast numbers" of foreigners, "English and American," who were received and sheltered in their sickness by the charity of the city. Very probably the good people of Rio have not yet become sufficiently *enlightened*, either to denounce "foreign paupers," or to burn down the churches of those who happen to differ with them in faith! They may yet learn something of this species of charity from their northern neighbors, especially if the itinerant missionaries, who are now visiting them, should happily succeed in rooting out the old faith, and substituting therefor their thousand and one new creeds, all right, yet all differing among themselves! When the Bible will have been fully introduced into Rio, we may perhaps hear of its being paraded through the streets as a party ensign, and a commentary on its principles being written in fire and blood, as lately happened in Philadelphia under the happy auspices of the preachers!

But really we anticipate no such glorious results, unless indeed subsequent missionaries should succeed much better than did the Rev. Mr. Kidder and his associate, the Rev. Justin Spaulding. Mr. Kidder does not tell us of a single convert made either by himself or his worthy colleague, at least, if he does, it has entirely escaped our notice. The Rev. Justin Spaulding, his senior in the mission, was chiefly employed in teaching a common day school at Rio during the week; and he performed Protestant service on Sundays in a room, "where a respectable congregation, *chiefly composed of American and English residents*, regularly worshipped and listened to the preaching of the Gospel."† Mr. Kidder himself could not preach in

* Chap. v, vol. i, p. 79, seqq. †V. i, 159, 160.

* Vol. ii, 46, 47. † Vol. i, 136.

Portuguese,* and, therefore, confined himself to the distribution of Bibles, Testaments, and tracts. He, in fact, with admirable simplicity lets out the secret that his whole mission turned out pretty much of a failure: of course he does not say so in so many words, but he says so in substance. He tell us:

"Indeed, the whole system of means by which, in Protestant countries, access is had to the public mind, is unpractised and unknown (in Brazil). The stranger, therefore, and especially the supposed heretic, who would labor for the promotion of true religion (!), must expect to avail himself of providential openings, rather than to rely on previously concerted plans. The missionary, in such circumstances, learns a lesson of great practical importance to himself: to wit, that he should be grateful for any occasion, *however small*, of *attempting* to do good in the name of his Master. The *romantic notions* which some entertain of a mission field, may become *chastened and humbled by* contact WITH THE COLD REALITY OF FACTS; but the Christian heart will not be rendered harder, nor genuine faith less susceptible of an entire reliance on God."†

His resignation is almost as edifying as his want of success is prominent and clearly marked. What surprises us most, is that Protestants in this country will still consent to be deluded with the hope of *perverting* Catholic countries to their own novel and *cameleon* doctrines, in the face of such avowals as this, and after the notorious failure of all previous schemes for the same purpose. What astonishes us, is not the fact that Brother Jonathan has been *gulled* in the matter,—for every one knows that he is his own father's son in this amiable foible,—but that he has consented to draw so heavily on his pockets to support a bubble that has already burst so often, and must always burst in future, so sure as similar causes always produce similar effects under the same circumstances. Protestantism is doomed to barrenness. What nation or people has it ever converted from paganism to Christianity? What good has come of all the millions of money it has expended, and of the millions of Bibles and tracts it has circulated? Has the Bible circulated among the people ever converted a tribe or nation? If so, where is it to be found?

The Bible itself says that "faith comes by *hearing*;"* and yet these reverend missionaries, out of pure love for the Bible, seek to nullify this divine principle, and to prove that faith comes by *reading!* Can we, then, wonder at their repeated and total failures in converting the world? Besides, in attempting to circulate the Bible among Catholics in Catholic countries, they proceed on the glaring falsehood and calumny—already refuted a thousand times—that but for *their* efforts the Bible would be there a wholly unknown and sealed book!! The Bible was known, and read, and loved by Catholics long centuries before all these new and quarrelling and self-glorifying and almost infinitely multiplied religious notions became current in the world. And still these new men but of yesterday would fain persuade the world that it is indebted to *them* for the Bible!! Out on such assumption and hypocrisy! Our Saviour commanded his apostles to *preach*, but never uttered a syllable about *writing*; and how can these *new and self-sent* apostles, who pursue a totally different course, hope for success?

We have seen that Mr. Kidder did not know Portuguese enough to be able to preach in that language. One would think that he ought to have learned the Portuguese before going to Brazil. He could not hope to do the service for which he was *well paid* without this necessary qualification, and *justice* seemed to require that he should have taken the pains to acquire before accepting the mission. Like most other missionaries, he took his wife and family with him to share in the apostolic (!) labors and rich *emoluments* of the mission,—for missionary wives receive salaries as well as their husbands, why not? they do at least as much good;—but just as he was about preparing him-

* Vol. i, 190. † Vol. i, 312-13.

* Romans x.

self to preach in Portuguese, his heart was rent with anguish by her sudden death, and he was compelled to return precipitately to America, "as a hopeful means of preserving the life of an infant son."* We heartily sympathize with him in his bereavement; but every one must see, from this tragic circumstance, that "if he had been unmarried he would have been without solicitude," and would not have been compelled to leave his mission so suddenly. When will these preachers learn to prize the example and to follow the advice of St. Paul? "Art thou loosed from a wife? SEEK NOT A WIFE."†

We had intended to make some more remarks: as, for example, to mention that *Fejio*, the pretended Brazilian bishop who wrote the work against the celibacy of the clergy, pretty well known in this country, was never actually a bishop, but a very bad priest, who left the holy ministry, married, devoted himself wholly to politics, and wrote this work probably to defend his apostacy and sacrilegious violation of solemn vows. He was the Taleyrand of Brazil. We wished also to say that Mr. Kidder found schools every where throughout the Brazilian empire—a pretty severe rebuke to those who are for ever inveighing against "popish" ignorance and superstition. But our paper is filled, and we must conclude, referring those who wish for additional information to the work itself.

* Vol. ii, 351-3. † Corinth. vii, 27.

GEOLOGY AT VARIANCE WITH SCRIPTURE.*

A former article upon this subject, we endeavored to show that those who unwisely concede all that geologists claim to have proved, are in danger of being involved in error. Our success was quite equal to our expectations—our geological friends treated the whole subject with that dignified silence recommended in the Scotchman's adage, "least said is soonest mended," while a few theological friends, less discreet, loudly exclaimed against the unfair use of facts and arguments which, they unwittingly conceded, they could neither dispute nor disprove. Within its legitimate province, geology has been, and must for ever be, a most important branch of natural science. It is hers to investigate the present structure of the earth by studying the character and the distribution of the several deposits, and comparing the differences or the resemblances in the strata of distant regions—it is hers to develop the mineral wealth of a country, and to increase its agricultural resources. The prosecution of such objects would seem to afford ample verge and space for the industry and the ingenuity of the science of all succeeding generations till the end of time. Did her pretensions stop here we should have nothing to say, save perchance to bid her God speed in a career of usefulness. But it must be apparent to every one who has read any recent geological work, to every one who has listened to any of our distinguished professors of geology, that all the facts so laboriously collected seem to be prized not so much for their intrinsic value, not so much for their power to contribute to the necessities or the comforts of the human race, but rather as the basis upon which every man is at liberty to build up whatsoever figments of the brain he may think most plausible. That the facts of geology are used for such purposes, we think no one will venture to deny. In this way all the modern systems of cosmogony

* See remarks on this article under the editorial head.—ED.

have been manufactured, and in this they claim a superiority over those of past centuries, which had not even the shadow of a foundation. Yet the practical difference is not as great as might be supposed. Whiston, without any examination of the earth, assumed it to have been originally a comet which had repented of the error of its ways, and had quietly and soberly settled down in a regular course. Weiner did examine his own vicinity, and, from the appearances presented, came to the conclusion that the earth had been created as a semifluid or pasty chaotic mass, wherein the materials gradually subsided, forming successive deposits, enveloping the whole planet, and placed one over another, like the coats of an onion. The one adopted an absurdity without foundation; the other preferred an absurdity which professed to be built upon facts. If we take one of the latest speculations, that of Dr. Lyell, we shall find it differs not at all, in a logical point of view, from that Weiner. Lyell's theory is based upon observation; so was Weiner's. The one is no more probable now than the other was in its day. If the Englishman's observations are more multiplied, and his inferences apparently more probable than those of his German predecessor at this time, it is an advantage that time has given him, and one that he must yield as fully to those who follow him a century hence. Lyell's explanations most beautifully account for present appearances so far as the earth's surface has been examined—so did Weiner's. It would be strange indeed if this were not so, since the explanations of the facts in all cases are invented expressly to suit the facts. Lyell's theory is perfectly satisfactory to many of his cotemporaries—so was Weiner's. The air-built castle of the German stood until it was pulled down to furnish materials for his successors to build with. Such has been the fate of every theory that has yet been offered—such must be the fate of all now in vogue—such must ever be the fate of all that are yet to come. If Dr. Lyell's or any other theory is propounded as true, we will admit it to be as true now as Weiner's was in his day: if it be said the new one is more probable than the old, we grant it, since the garment of the child will not fit the adult. The old theory was expressly adapted to the facts then known; but the world has grown in knowledge as well as years, and a new theory is required to accommodate facts now known.

All natural science, we contend, rests on hypothesis, and none of its deductions can ever advance beyond a greater or less degree of probability. Geology is emphatically in this predicament. Certain appearances are noted that seem to indicate a change in the relative level of land and water, and immediately speculation is at work. This alteration has manifestly been produced suddenly and violently, says one. Not so, says another; every thing shows that it has been the result of a slow action continued during some millions of years. But, says the advocate for a sudden catastrophe, you will admit that if such violent action had taken place, the result might have been, and probably would have been, just what we now see. And then we have evidence of the occurrence of analogous violent and sudden alterations of the earth's surface since the existence of authentic records. Very true, says the friend of quiet revolutions, but no evidence exists that any one has ever witnessed any sudden and violent action commensurate to that which you here suppose, whereas a more gradual action, such as has been seen and known to take place, will abundantly suffice to explain every thing if we will only allow sufficient time; therefore, it seems to me much more probable that all the great changes on the surface of the earth have been brought about by the slow and long continued operation of forces that are still acting, and which in a few millions of years seem destined to produce other changes as great as those brought about in the millions that have passed. Such is a fair specimen of the reasoning of geologists. Some pe-

culiar condition of the earth attracts notice, and conjecture is despatched without chart or compass in quest of an explanation. To say that the one brought back is generally admirably suited to the particular case, is paying but an ordinary compliment to the inventive faculty of its author, since the very task he has imposed upon himself is to make one that will suit. The explanation thus framed is immediately assumed to be true, and the facts to which it applies are then offered as incontestable proof of the truth of the explanation. Such reasoning appears in all its beautiful proportions when divested of all extraneous matter, and presented in the syllogistic form.

I. The western coast of South America has been elevated during the last century about six feet perpendicularly.

II. There are indications that such elevations have occurred, at about the same rate, during an indefinite number of centuries past.

III. Therefore, that country has been thus slowly elevated for a few hundred thousand years past.

I. The western coast of South America has been elevated at the rate of six feet in a century for many hundred thousand years past.

II. The Andes are elevated but little more than twenty thousand feet above the level of the ocean.

III. Therefore, the Andes have been raised to their present position during the last few hundred thousand years by the slow action of the same cause that more recently has raised the adjacent coast.

Do you know, gentle reader, the origin of our present continents? We can enlighten you in a trice, if you are not over particular in examining our ratiocination. It will only require another pair of syllogisms, and here they are:

I. By the agency of running water immense quantities of sand, gravel and clay, more or less minutely divided, are continually carried into the ocean, and distributed over its bed by means of ocean currents. If these materials, thus accumulated and distributed, should become consolidated under the influence of hydrostatic pressure, aided possibly by the influence of central heat, we would have rocky strata enveloping various forms of shells and other marine productions slowly forming at the bottom of the ocean.

II. But the materials carried down do become thus consolidated.

III. Therefore, regularly stratified rocks, analogous, if not similar to those of our present continents, are daily forming in the bed of every ocean.

I. The relative level of land and water on different parts of the earth's surface is now undergoing a slow change.

II. But if the present ocean bed should be raised above the water level at any future time, it would exhibit a structure like that of our present continents.

III. Therefore, our present continents once constituted the bed of a former ocean, and consist of the debris of the previously existing dry land, carried down and consolidated during a few hundred thousand years by the operation of causes still acting.

We will not insult the understandings of our readers by stopping to point out the fallacy of such arguments—but we may safely undertake to put any geological speculation that has reference to the origin of the present state of things into the same ridiculous category. Albeit, it may seem like breaking butterflies upon the wheel. After all, we shall, doubtless, be told that we are throwing away our labor when we undertake to prove that such geological theories can not be offered as absolutely true. We may be told that their authors do not view them in any other light than as mere probabilities, perchance in the highest degree probable, but nothing more. In reply we can only give our own experience. We have never known any geologist refuse to admit the hypothetical nature of his science, when this admission has been extorted. Yet we have never heard a lecturer on the subject who did

not speak with the utmost confidence in his original or adopted theories: we have never heard one who ever gave his audience the slightest reason to doubt his own conviction of the truth of all he offered. We have never read a geological work that inculcated the least distrust of the correctness of the author's views—very rarely one that admitted the possibility of error in any, even the wildest conjecture. In private we may compel an admission of fallibility, but in public all virtually claim infallibility. Absolute truth in all matters pertaining to physical science can be attained only in one way. It must come through the medium of the senses, or it comes not at all—we may have shrewd conjecture or strong probability without appealing to the senses, but physical truth can never be obtained without their concurrence. For every builder of geological systems the question stands recorded: "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?" As the human eye saw not when the "corner-stone thereof" was laid, so the human mind can never be certain of the accuracy of its conclusions, when, reasoning from the present order of things, it attempts to determine what was the order that originally existed.

We will assume, then, that our geological friends are willing to abandon the claim of absolute certainty for their scientific deductions, and offer them only as in the highest degree probable. Let us inquire whether this view can be sustained. All systems agree in assuming that the formation of the world was completed before the creation of man. Although changes of minor importance may have taken place since that period, changes effected by the operation of causes still in action, such as the influence of water in motion, of atmospheric agency, of volcanic action, &c., yet the various strata that now constitute the crust of the globe, not only the older and more solid masses, but the sands, and clays, and gravel regularly stratified in the more recent or tertiary deposits, all agree were arranged in their present relative position before man appeared upon the stage. All assume that the grand geological features of our planet, now so prominent, had already been impressed upon it when man first became acquainted with it, and that the whole physical universe is now pretty much what it was at that time. These are all fundamental assumptions too obviously true to allow any one heretofore, with the slightest regard for his reputation, to call them in question. From the evidence of our own senses, and of those on whom we can rely, we are very well acquainted with the present condition of the surface of the earth. What its condition was when it first came perfect from the hands of its maker, we know still better, for God himself has told us he "saw all the things that he had made, and they were very good." That is, for the purpose for which all things had been made they were the very best that omniscience and omnipotence could produce. Nothing less than this could suffice for a dwelling place for him who had been made but little lower than the angels, and in the image and likeness of God. Sin had not yet entered the world—on man in a state of innocence and justice the blessing had been pronounced: "increase and multiply and fill the earth:" consequently the whole earth must have been as perfectly adapted for the habitation of man as was that particular spot where the first man had been formed. Is the present condition of our earth such that man could live comfortably without clothing and without labor on any very large proportion of its surface? Will the eternal ice of the circumpolar regions, or the burning sky and deadly atmosphere of the equatorial, or the alternating extremes of heat and cold of more temperate zones, offer a fit dwelling? Those very evidences of the wisdom and goodness of Providence, those adaptations of the physical world to our wants and our comforts so constantly cited to confound the infidel, are unmeaning, or worse than unmean-

ing, unless we restrict our view to the present condition of things—to man in a fallen state—to the earth accursed for the sin of man. The inexhaustible beds of coal found in regions where fuel is indispensable; the abundance of iron ore so necessary for the innumerable wants of civilized life; the invaluable mineral deposits made accessible by fractures and displacements of strata imbedding them, how useless all to man in a state of innocence. The lightning's flash, the whirlwind, and the tornado, although beneficial for purifying and renovating the breath of heaven, have yet sent thousands unstriven to their long account. Sin placed all the creatures of God, both animate and inanimate, in open rebellion against him who was to have been their master. Human intellect, it is true, is most frequently victor in the strife—the Esquimaux can live buried in his snows, and we boast of having subdued the waves—yet not infrequently the snow wreath and the billow overwhelm their victims. Man's life on earth is a warfare, not only morally, but physically—from the cradle to the grave he must strive with the agents of nature for a precarious existence. It seems to us very clear that men are indirectly indebted to the devil for most of what are termed triumphs of human ingenuity. Had not the arch-fiend disturbed the repose of the garden of Eden, man certainly would not now be delving in the bowels of the earth for the means to support life upon its surface; rail roads would never have been invented, nor steam engines exploded; gunpowder and the art of printing, spectacles and telescopes, mesmerism and the French opera would never have entered into the human imagination.

Either the whole earth originally was fit for the habitation of man in his original state, or it was not. If only one little spot, the garden of Eden, was so fitted, while the rest of the earth's surface was as we now find it, good enough for sinners, but not suitable for man before the fall, then the blessing of the Almighty would seem to involve a contradiction. To say to Adam, "increase, and multiply, and fill the earth," while the earth was not fit to receive such increase, while it was utterly unsuitable for a dwelling place for his posterity, had they remained innocent, would seem to be quite as contradictory as if Adam had been told to "increase and multiply," while the power to propagate his species had been denied him. The Almighty could not have meant to say, "fill the earth with sinners, for I have prepared it as a place for them to do penance for their sins." Neither could he have intended to subject the innocent to the punishment due only to sin, by sending them into a world provided expressly for the sinful. Therefore does it seem most probable to us that the whole earth must have been fitted for the habitation of innocent and just men. The one grand oversight made by modern science is that it keeps out of view all reference to the moral and the spiritual, when treating of the physical. It seems undeniable that man consists of soul and body, that each influences the other for good and for evil, that the physical was created only to minister to the spiritual, that all the events of this life, without exception, are directed or overruled by a wise Providence, to aid each immortal soul in attaining the great end for which it was created, the possession of everlasting life. And all this would seem to establish so intimate a connection between the moral and physical world, as to render it impossible for any great revolution to occur in the one without materially influencing the other. Another difficulty in the contemplation of this subject arises from an unwillingness to admit the possibility of any long continuance of man's original state of innocence and justice. We know it was of but short duration, and many, unconsciously, perhaps, accustom themselves to consider it as necessarily and inevitably terminating when it did. Yet it must be remembered that when man was created innocent, and endowed with reason and freewill, the

destiny marked out for him by his Creator was widely different from that which he himself chose. In the original all things must have been adapted, in the most perfect manner, to the design of the Almighty. Man was to remain upon the earth for a brief space, as in a place of probation, and was then to be translated to heaven, the term of his existence. While on earth he would have been occupied, as the blessed are in heaven, in contemplating the wisdom, and adoring the goodness and the perfections of the Author of his being. Labor, as such, would not have been required for his wants; disease would have been utterly unknown, and old age, and decrepitude, and death would have been unmeaning terms, for sin would not have engendered among us that hell-born brood of vices that now minister to the lusts and passions of human nature, turning at times earth itself into a living hell. There are doubtless many restless minds so thoroughly imbued with the spirit of progress, so strikingly developed in our age, as to lead them to waver a little were they called upon to choose between that quiet life of innocence we can but feebly comprehend, and the stirring and bustling scenes of these more enlightened days. We have already been told by a well-meaning friend, that if Adam and Eve had nothing more to do in the garden than we have supposed, they ought to have been turned out, and set to work. Nor do we suppose our friend singular in his opinion. More than one half of mankind would undoubtedly come to the same conclusion, and the source of the error is very evident. If we find men, age after age, steadily pursuing the things of this life as if they were to possess them for ever; if we find all the resources of superior intellects, all the discoveries and inventions of science, all the ingenuity of the mechanic arts, apparently directed almost exclusively to contribute to the luxuries of this life, generation after generation striving to multiply the thousand lilliputian cords that bind our tastes and affections, our hopes and fears, to this world; if we find men advocating the propriety and necessity for excluding all reference to the great end of man's creation, while discussing questions of natural or political science, nay, even of morality, we may be sure whatever such men's theoretical faith may be, their practical faith will be found widely different. Their powers and faculties of mind and body will be considered as especially bestowed to enable them to make themselves as comfortable as possible. Their great duty will be to strive to ameliorate (as the phrase is) the condition of the human race generally, by whatsoever devices will bring themselves fame or wealth, perchance by sending "moral pocket handkerchiefs" to the little negroes in the West Indies, or by diffusing the blessings of civilization and a taste for ardent spirits among savage nations. Or if they should be so fortunate as to contrive any plan by which locomotives could be driven two hundred and fifty miles per hour without danger to the traveller, or so improve the power-loom that fifty yards of cotton cloth could be made with no greater expenditure of time and money than is now required to make one yard, they would feel as if they had fulfilled their destiny, and amid the plaudits of millions they might lie down peacefully in the sleep of death, confident of having won an eternal reward.

The inability fully to comprehend the wide difference in the moral world before and after the fall, adds much to the difficulty in conceiving the difference in the physical world. That a great change must equally have occurred in both, seems perfectly undeniable by those who reflect upon the subject, while, if we admit that such change did take place, we leave not the least vestige of foundation for any of the ingenious systems of modern cosmogony. Viewing the question merely as a balance of probabilities, it seems to us that geologists have adopted that which is most improbable. The world we now see can not be the perfect work that an omnipotent

and omniscient Being completed and pronounced "very good." The world around us is a world in ruins, with strata broken and dislocated, whole forests buried and carbonized, generation upon generation of living things engulfed alive, every where disorder, here marks of a wide spread inundation, there evidence of terrible volcanic action, one district has been raised from the depths of the ocean, while another has been swallowed up in the abyss. So striking are these marks of devastation, that we need not be surprised at the quaint explanation given by some of the fathers, who supposed that the devil had been let loose to ravage the earth at his pleasure. But if the earth, with all this confusion, is not now in the state it was when man was created, then the assumptions of geology are false, for these require us to believe that when man entered the world he found himself surrounded (at least outside of one little spot) by all the adverse influences that now abridge the comfort and the term of human life. If it be urged that these evidences of confusion are really marks of beneficent design, having special reference to the wants of mankind, we admit it in reference to fallen man, but not to man innocent and just. We admit that the beneficence of the Deity is thus admirably shown in educing good out of evil, but contend that the condition of the world best fitted for man in his present state, would not have been at all suitable for man in his original state. Now the condition of the world before the fall must have been well calculated for man at that time, therefore it must have been widely different from its present condition, and, therefore, geologists have no right to argue from present appearances as to what were the appearances at that period. To bring the whole question in a briefer compass, we may state it more precisely thus:

I. The habitation for man in a state of innocence and justice must be one where he can live without labor, and without any physical suffering or inconvenience.

II. No one can live in our present world without labor, physical suffering, or inconvenience.

III. Therefore the world in its present state would be unsuitable as a dwelling for man in a state of innocence and justice.

When God said to Adam, "Increase and multiply and fill the earth," the whole earth was then fitted to receive Adam's posterity in the same state in which he then was, or it was not.

If the whole earth was not fitted to receive Adam's innocent and just posterity, then the permission given by God to man to "fill the earth" involves an absurdity.

God must have meant "fill the earth" with innocent beings, or with beings not innocent.

Permission to "fill the earth" with innocent beings when the earth was not in a state fit to receive them, manifestly involves an absurdity.

To suppose that God gave his permission and his benediction to man to "fill the earth" with beings not innocent, would involve an intention on the part of the Almighty to introduce sin into the world, which is equally absurd.

I. Therefore the whole earth must have been fitted to receive Adam's posterity in the same state in which he then was.

II. But the earth at present is totally unfit for the habitation of such beings.

III. Therefore the present condition of the earth must be very different from the condition which it exhibited before the fall of man.

I. The present state of the earth is, then, very different from that which existed before the fall of man.

II. But geologists contend that the present state of the earth, at least in all its grand geological features, was completed before the creation of man.

III. Therefore geologists are in error.

This last conclusion, it appears to us, can not readily be avoided unless by those who may be already wedded to some favorite theory, which they assume to be true without reason, and of course main-

tain in defiance of reason. Unless our arguments involve some fallacy that we can not detect, it would appear that the grand fundamental proposition of geologists, that which is found at the basis of every system offered to explain the formation of the world, the proposition that all the grand geological revolutions on our planet must have been completed before the creation of man, can not be offered as true—can not be offered even as most probable. To the Catholic reader it can be furthermore shown that all the modern systems of geology are not only improbable, but in the very highest degree improbable, since all of them demand a longer time to complete the world than can be allowed, if we understand the Mosaic account of the creation in its proper literal sense. It is a mere quibble to charge us with begging the question, and assuming that geology contradicts Scripture—we make no such assumption. On the contrary we know full well that geology may be made to appear to confirm Scripture, if we permit geologists to interpret the words of Scripture to suit themselves. In other words, with a little ingenuity the words of revelation can be twisted so as not to contradict science. We assert that geology contradicts Scripture, taken in its proper literal sense, not as an assumption, but as a fact universally conceded by geologists themselves. In accordance with this fact, volumes have been written to show how beautifully the science confirms the word of God if that is understood in a metaphorical sense. All geologists agree that the literal meaning of the first chapter of Genesis is absurd, but deny that science contradicts it, since the literal meaning is not the true meaning. Take the words of that chapter metaphorically, they say, and there is no contradiction. If there is any literal sense to the first chapter of Genesis, then all prominent geological systems contradict it, and, therefore, to state the fact can never be unfair, unless upon the plea that the truth can not be fairly stated. To those who can find no literal sense in the said chapter we have nothing to say, except to advise them earnestly to go back to their rudiments, and study the ordinary meaning of words. From the earliest systems of cosmogony to the present day, the manufacturers of the theories have tacitly admitted the necessity for reconciling their fancies with the words of Scripture. All apparent agreements are brought forward conspicuously, all apparent disagreements are as carefully kept in the back ground. Or if pointed out by some one with more zeal than discretion, he is coolly told that any apparent contradiction proves nothing, since the Bible was not given to man to teach him geology, but for higher and holier purposes. The Bible, we conceive, was given to man to teach him truth, and unless we choose to deny revelation, we are compelled to believe that every thing contained in the Bible is absolutely true, whether we can understand it or not. Consequently no theory, no conclusion, though apparently as clear as the sun at noonday, can be for a moment maintained, if the said theory or conclusion can be shown at variance with the meaning of Scripture. But, it will be asked, how are we to know the true meaning of Scripture? The Protestant has one method for determining this, the Catholic another—both can not be right. That the Protestant must always be wrong, except by accident, while the Catholic must always be right, we leave to be demonstrated by theologians. Our remarks are for those who adopt the Catholic rule, who profess to deny the right of private interpretation, and who are bound, in all cases, to receive the interpretation of the church. But the church has not spoken authoritatively in regard to the meaning of the whole Scripture. Certain things have been defined, and are therefore matters of faith; others have been left undefined. Now Mr. X., a good Catholic, claims the right to interpret these matters which have been left undefined, in the way which to him seems most reasonable

and logical, and thus establishes a particular meaning. Mr. Y., an equally good son of the church, claims the same right, and in the same exercise of it reaches another, and perchance a very different meaning. In this way we may have two or two dozen different interpretations of the same passage, and who shall decide which is the true one. If this right of private interpretation is conceded, which strangely enough is done by a few very eminent men, there is no authority less than that of a general council that can decide in the case we have supposed. But such is not the opinion of the fathers of the church. They declare that no private interpretation of the Scripture can be allowed, unless in accordance with a certain rule which has been the guide of all interpreters from remote antiquity: a rule which has existed in its present form during the last fourteen hundred years; which during all that time has received the acquiescence and the sanction of the Catholic church; which in that time has extinguished and outlived innumerable heresies, and unmasked and annihilated innumerable errors; which is incorporated in the best treatises on dogmatic theology now extant, and which at the present moment is found indispensably necessary as authority by every teacher of theology. It is the rule of St. Augustine, so called, not because he was the author, for it dates back beyond his day, but because he first published it in the form in which it has been transmitted to us. "The words of Scripture must be taken and explained in the proper and literal sense, when nothing follows from them, so taken, either false, absurd, impossible or contrary to the truth of faith or to good morals." With this rule all controversies can be settled, all discrepancies and contradictions avoided; without it they might become as numerous and as noisy as the frogs of Egypt. But we are not at liberty to reject it, coming with the sanction it has received, unless we choose to incur the imputation of rashness. Such would seem to be the prevailing opinion, since we have never seen or heard of a theologian or commentator who denied its authority. To show how it is applied by standard authors and sound theologians, I need only quote Cornelieus a Lapide. To his commentary on the Pentateuch of Moses he has prefixed certain canons as received by the church for the interpretation of Scripture—we copy the first two.

"Canon 1. Cum Moses hic historiam mundi conscribat patet narrationem ejus non symbolicam, non allegoricam non mysticam, sed historicam simplicem et planam esse; ac provinde ea quæ narrat de parradisi Adami, Evæ etrerum omnium creatione spatio sex dierum successive peracta, &c. historice et proprie ut sonant suntaccipienda. Est hoc contra Originem qui hæc omnia allegorice et symbolice exponenda putavit, itaque literam et literalem sensum eventit. Verum canonem nostrum tradunt omnes alii patres et ecclesia, quæ hic damnat allegorias Originis.

"Canon 2. Philosophiá et physica adaptanda sunt sacræ Scripturæ et verbo Dei, a quo omnis existit naturæ numeras, ordo et modus vit S. Augustinus. Non ergo e contrario torquenda est sacra Scriptura ad sensa philosophorum, aut ad lumen et dictamen naturæ."

It would be difficult to find any clearer explanation than this of the manner in which the rule of St. Augustine is to be employed. It is objected, however, that St. Augustine himself departed from this rule, and, therefore, he can not be considered as good authority. If we had no authority for the rule but his undivided authority—if no one but himself had recognised and employed it, then the objection that he had not always observed it would be undoubtedly good. But if it has the authority of "omnes patres et ecclesia;" if they have adopted and enforced it for more than fourteen hundred years, and if St. Augustine, when departing from it, is corrected for violating an acknowledged canon of interpretation, then these very violations of the law indirectly bear

testimony to the authority of the law. In the commentary just quoted, the author speaking of the fifth verse of the first chapter of Genesis, after stating St. Augustin's conjecture that the six days of creation should be understood in a mystical sense, the Almighty having created and perfected every thing on the first day, thus concludes: "Verum contrarium docent omnes alii patres, idque omnino evincit simplex et historica narratio Mosis." And again, a little below, after quoting another of the mystical interpretations of St. Augustine, he adds: "Hace vera et pia sunt; sed mystica non litteralia." It is objected again that the rule in question was only intended to apply to matters that pertain to a future life, and should not be applied to questions purely historical or scientific. A most convenient supposition introduced to obviate a supposed difficulty, but which being purely gratuitous can not be entertained. The rule purports to be universal, applicable to the whole Bible, and invariable, never to be deviated from, and no authority less than that which established and sanctioned it can be permitted to restrict or alter it. At least no alteration or restricted meaning can be urged as good and true until it has received the same approbation that has been given to the rule as it now stands. It is easy for any individual to say, I understand it in this or in that sense different from its obvious sense; but this merely proves that it is easier to talk than argue. If the rule is not invariable and universal in its application, it can have no authority at all, since the result would be precisely the same whether we allow private judgment to determine the meaning of the text, or the same judgment to determine when the rule shall be applied or when it may be withheld. The statute imposes a penalty for all libellous words, but how many convictions for libel should we have in the course of a year if we exempt from this law every man who is perfectly satisfied that it should not be applied in his particular case? We should have as unbridled liberty of speech with such a statute as if we had no law upon the subject.

By our rule we are required to take the proper literal meaning as the true meaning of the first chapter of Genesis, unless by so doing we find something therein contained "false, absurd, impossible," &c. For the benefit of those who profess not to know what is meant by the literal meaning of a passage, we may again quote Cornelius a Lapide. In his fortieth canon he says: "In sensu litterali omnes sententiæ omniaque verba debent explicari et accommodari rei significate; * * * * sicut enim litteralis est is quem primo verba significant," &c. &c. According to this, we understand the proper literal meaning of this chapter, so far as it has reference to the time occupied in the formation of the world, to be just what Moses himself declares it is when in Exodus he tells us that "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth and all that in them is." But it is objected that we can not come to this conclusion until we settle the literal meaning of the whole chapter. This is by no means necessary, since our purpose is not to explain the first chapter of Genesis, but simply to demonstrate the absurdity and inconclusiveness in the reasoning of geologists, their aiders and abettors. If we can establish a contradiction between the assumptions of geology and any part of the first chapter of Genesis taken in the sense we are required to take it by the rule of the Catholic church, we shall have accomplished our object, for whatsoever contradicts truth must be error. In reference to the first two verses, we distinguish between creation and formation. There can be no question that God created heaven and earth, that is, the matter of the whole universe, in a single instant, by a single volition, and it is equally clear that he then occupied six days in the formation of this matter into the perfect universe. It is not said in the beginning God *made* heaven and earth, but God *created* heaven and earth, and the writer then proceeds to state, in the narrative of

the six days, how the materials thus originally created were afterwards disposed. It would be foreign to our purpose to pursue this subject farther at this time. Of one thing we may be well assured, that the proper literal meaning of one part of this chapter can never be contradicted by the true meaning of any other part. If the apparent meaning of one passage seems to contradict the proper literal meaning of another, it merely proves this apparent meaning to be erroneous, since, involving a contradiction, it involves an absurdity, and by our rule must be rejected.

Taking the definition already given in regard to the proper literal meaning of any passage, and applying it to the narrative of the work of six days, it seems impossible to come to any other than one conclusion, viz. that the work was accomplished in six days of twenty-four hours each. The text declares it, and the context confirms it. This is the sense in which geologists understand it when they insist upon giving a metaphorical meaning to the word day. To understand this word literally, they say, involves an absurdity; first, because there could have been no day in the literal sense before the sun was created, and that did not happen until the fourth day; and, secondly, because geology has proved it is necessary to admit a longer time than six literal days to account for the various geological revolutions that have taken place on our planet, and which must have taken place before the creation of man. If these positions are true, we must abandon the literal meaning, and consider these six days as six periods of indefinite length. First, there is no absurdity in supposing days before the appearance of the sun, since there was certainly light and darkness alternating with each other, producing evening and morning, and, moreover, it is not the apparent motion of the sun that measures our day, but the revolution of the earth on its axis. No traveller within the arctic circle ever pretended to make the true day correspond with the apparent day as measured by the sun. Invariably all calculate successive intervals of twenty-four hours as so many days whether the sun is continuously above or below the horizon. It is not the appearance and disappearance of the sun then that constitutes the day, but the time of the earth's revolution on its axis, and that could have measured the day for the three days before the sun appeared as well as it does now during the six months it is absent from the polar sky. Secondly, geologists claim to have proved that six literal days will not suffice to explain the geological formations on our planet, but their so called proof, resting on hypothesis, can prove nothing when it is opposed to the obvious sense of Scripture. If we admit as true all they claim as true, then the Mosaic account, taken literally, is absurd. But our rule requires us to take the Mosaic account literally as true until in this sense it has been proved absolutely absurd or false, &c. To prove it hypothetically absurd or false will not suffice, and yet such is the only kind of proof that geology can pretend to offer. The science is based upon hypotheses seemingly so plausible and conclusive as easily to mislead any one not forewarned against insidious error. Certain fossiliferous strata are found showing the existence of certain animal forms in some remote period. Immediately it is said these deposits must have been completed, and the extinct animals whose remains are here preserved must have lived and died before man was created. Therefore the deposits were completed, and the animals did live and die at that time—this has now become a fact—a fixed point from which the man of science starts to discover other facts on which he stands to prove the absurdity of the literal text of Moses. Are any incredulous? proof can be furnished thus wise; if we suppose certain geological revolutions to have occurred in a certain order of succession before man was created, we can satisfactorily explain present appearances. And as no other explanation can be given as plausible or as probable, and as this (mirabile dictu) sa-

tisfactorily explains all the phenomena in question, we are compelled to admit it as true, or at least as in the very highest degree probable. Such is always the reasoning of geologists whenever they quit the investigation of facts to speculate on their causes. However satisfactory it may be to them, however useful it may prove by stimulating inquiry and research, yet, examined by the rules of logic, it must ever stand purely hypothetical in its premises, and clearly hypothetical in all its deductions. While we have no hesitation in admitting that such hypothetical probabilities may be legitimately employed as data to reason from, and as guides to conduct to other probabilities, provided they do not come in conflict with the proper literal sense of Scripture, yet where they do not conflict with revelation, the Catholic has no alternative but to reject them as improbable, or to reject the rule of St. Augustine as of no authority. The whole argument may again be stated in a few lines.

1. All conclusions based on hypothesis must be themselves hypothetical, and can not be offered as absolutely true.

2. All the deductions of geology are based on hypothesis.

3. Therefore, all the deductions of geology are hypothetical, and can not be offered as absolutely true.

1. The words of Scripture must be taken in their proper literal sense unless such sense can be proved absolutely absurd or false, &c.

2. The deductions of geology are hypothetical, and can only show a hypothetical absurdity or falsity, &c.

3. Therefore, the words of Scripture must be taken in their proper literal sense, notwithstanding this sense may be opposed to the deductions of geology.

Whenever scientific men feel themselves compelled to admit that the six days of the Mosaic account can not be viewed as indefinite periods, but must be considered as ordinary days, their only resource is to abandon the metaphorical view as not at all essential, since all that science demands is an indefinitely long period before the creation of man, during which it is proposed to aid the Almighty in putting things to rights. What is to hinder us, they say, from supposing an indefinitely long period to have intervened between the beginning of all things, the first creation of matter, and the beginning of the work of the six days, during which period all these geological revolutions could have been most beautifully accomplished? There would seem to be several reasons why this subterfuge can not be made available. No one, that we are aware, has ever yet claimed express authority from Scripture for supposing such interval: all that can be said is that the sacred writer is silent on the subject. Then, we would ask, is this silence considered as sufficient authority for making the supposition, no matter how imperiously it may be demanded by science? If the silence of the sacred writer is not good authority for the supposition, then, of course, it has no authority, then it is wholly gratuitous, and merely introduced to obviate a difficulty which can not otherwise be explained. No one, we suppose, would offer the difficulties to be explained as proof of the truth of the explanation, and yet if they are no proof, and if, as we suppose, the silence of the sacred writer is of no authority in the premises, then is the supposition wholly destitute of all shadow of proof, and then should it be abandoned. But it may be urged that the silence of the historian on this subject is good authority for the supposition of an indefinite interval between the creation of matter and the beginning of the work of the six days. This would prove too much, since those who take this ground, in order to preserve consistency, would be obliged to admit the following general proposition. We are allowed to offer as true any supposition not directly contradicted by the sacred writer. If this is to be allowed, then we can easily prove that our first parents had permission to eat flesh, since the Almighty, when indicating what was to be their food,

did not prohibit the use of flesh. Then too the advocate for polygamy can find authority for the custom, since the command to man, to leave father and mother and cleave to his wife, does not prohibit him from cleaving to another wife at the same time. Divested of extraneous matter, the argument stands thus. Geology asserts that a long interval elapsed between the creation of matter and the work of the six days, and in proof thereof offers first, the silence of the sacred historian, but this can prove nothing beyond the bare possibility of the thing, and that is no proof of its actual occurrence or of its probability. We are next referred to certain facts in the physical world as proof, but this supposition of a long interval has been invented expressly to account for these facts, and surely one can not appeal to the facts as proof of the truth of the supposition.

Apart from this view there is another, and we had almost said an obviously fatal objection to the supposition, forgetting how easily unfettered conjecture can overcome all difficulties. The necessity for the long interval of time preceding the creation of man arises from the multiplicity and the character of the fossils found imbedded in regular stratified deposits. Remains typical of all the forms of animal life are thus found from the most rudimentary to the most perfect. Enough is known of their structure and their habits to show that the physical conditions required for the existence of the animals whose remains are thus preserved, were the same as those now required for corresponding tribes. Among other conditions it can not be denied that light must have been indispensable. Corresponding tribes of existing animals could not live in a world totally destitute of light, neither could their predecessors. But the long interval required to explain the gradual deposition of these fossiliferous strata is assumed to have occurred before light had been created, while "the earth was void and empty, and darkness was upon the face of the deep." Any interval at this period, whether instantaneous or enduring for thousands of years, must be an interval of total darkness, since it was not until afterwards that God said "Fiat lux." To a straightforward matter of fact mind this difficulty might seem to be decisive. But infinite are the resources of science. Were we permitted to personify her and liken her to any thing human, we would select an East Indian rogue stripped and oiled, and ready for a nocturnal adventure—the fellow may possibly be caught, but it is absolutely impossible to hold him. How think you, gentle reader, geologist provide for these few thousands or millions of years before God made light? In the simplest possible way each man makes for himself as much as he wants; as a doctor's prescription would say, he takes a quantum sufficit, and, what is more, when he has done with the light, he puts it out again. So that when God wants light it is *reproduced*, in the language of Dr. Wiseman. To attempt to show the true character of such a grave absurdity, so manifestly containing within itself its own refutation, would appear to us like committing an equal absurdity. In this matter, as in several others, if conjecture is right, Moses is wrong.

If these words, "And God said, Be light made, and light was made," are understood to mean that light was made at that time, they convey a falsehood, since light had existed for thousands of years before. But those words do mean that light was then made, therefore they are false.

The objections made by Protestants themselves to the unwarrantable liberties taken by some with the sacred text have made later writers more cautious, and there is manifested now a strong disposition to evade as much as possible all discussions that threaten to bring out in too bold relief any conflicting claims of science and Scripture. Of course some stress is laid upon any points of agreement, real or fanciful, that may serve to

quiet the fears of the few who do not consider it polite to contradict the Almighty too flatly. At times a still more discreet course is adopted, by preserving a perfect silence on all perplexing subjects. Histories of the earth have been concocted, wherein it would seem the authors deemed it unimportant to introduce what God has revealed in relation to his own work. St. Paul taught that it is "by faith we understand that the world was framed by the word of God," but the modern apostles of science have announced that they are "able to declare his works, and to search out his glorious acts." Writers are to be found who profess to confine their views and speculations to the existing condition of things, who undertake to investigate merely the agencies which have given to our planet its present surface, who wish to go no farther back than merely to consider what immediately preceded our own geological epoch, and who expressly disclaim all intention of meddling with cosmogony. Thus it has been shown that the present state of things was probably preceded by another similar in all important respects, and differing, perchance, principally in the relative extent and relative position of dry land and water. Admitting all this, we may then ask what preceded that particular condition of things, and the answer must be another closely resembling it, and in this way we go backwards, rather indeterminately. According to this doctrine, if the world ever had a beginning, it must have come from the hands of its Maker pretty much in the state it now appears, since no provision is made for any other change except a greater or less alteration in the relative extent and position of land and water. No explanation can be admitted as sufficient to account for the present order of things, unless it will equally apply to any and all preceding similar states of our planet. Then we are unavoidably carried back to the creation, and we shall have the same battles to fight over again in determining the time that can be spared for completing the several catastrophes; or without going so far back, if the advocates for this view intimate at the outset, as Mr. Lyell does, that a few hundred thousand years will be required to enable them to do their work properly, we would say to them we know a workman who has accomplished the task in much less time, Him of whom it is said, "dixit et facta sunt." "Without unlimited time," say geologists, "we can not explain any thing, and therefore we must have time." If a system can be constructed which will stand the scrutiny when tried by those simple rules of logic daily applied in the ordinary concerns of life, to separate truth from fallacy, probability from conjecture, we will be the first to adopt it; but if it fails in the trial, away with it; the more plausible it may be, the more dangerous it is. Let scientific men frankly admit their inability to decide such subjects with their present data; let them leave these questions for future generations, and expend their intellectual energies upon topics more within their reach, and of more practical importance.

We admit that all the assumptions demanded by geology, in regard to the time required for the formation of the world, are fully conceded by a few Catholic commentators and living writers of high reputation. Whether these authors have been led into dangerous errors or not, is not for a mere layman to decide. We could not venture to sit in judgment on such distinguished scholars, and we leave them to be judged by their peers. Yet we may be permitted to contribute some few facts and arguments which seem necessary to enable any one to determine how far the concessions of these writers have been safe and proper, and how far they have been unwise and illogical. In all ages unyielding and arrogant pretension, if maintained with persevering skill, has generally accomplished its object. While the half learned are convinced, and the better informed silent from un-

willingness to make themselves conspicuous, the good natured and charitable, for the sake of peace, give up all that is demanded. This seems to us the true history of all the concessions that Catholic theologians have ever made to the demands of geology. They have been too charitable to suspect the total absence of all proof for hypotheses which have so long been claimed, as clearly and conclusively proved. Mons. Genoude and Dr. Wiseman both admit there is nothing to prevent any one from considering the six days of creation as six undefined epochs, or from supposing an undefined period intervening between the "beginning" and the commencement of the work of the six days. We might argue briefly that both these writers must have been aware of the existence and of the import of the rule of St. Augustine for the interpretation of Scripture, and either must have admitted or denied its authority in its plain and obvious sense. If they admitted its authority in that sense, then by their concessions to science they convict themselves, to say the least, of rashness. If they deny the authority of a rule acknowledged as valid by "omnes patres et ecclesia," then even we might venture to accuse them of rashness. Enough has been said in the preceding pages, we think, to convince any unbiassed mind that the best, if not the only way to dispose of this dilemma, is to assert that it is no dilemma, to maintain that the writers acknowledged the rule, but did not understand it in the sense we do. We have already given reasons why the rule must be taken in its plain and obvious sense, or wholly rejected, but we will now consider for a moment the apparently inevitable consequences of admitting any modified interpretation. Let us then suppose a writer attaches to this rule some meaning, which enables him to understand the Mosaic account of the creation and formation of the world in a metaphorical sense, and thus permits him to concede to science what the two authors above mentioned have conceded. We would say to him, if we allow you to interpret the first chapter of Genesis metaphorically, you can not deny us the privilege of interpreting the seventh chapter in the same manner. We can bring unanswerable geological arguments to prove the physical impossibility of the universality of the Noachian deluge. It is true, "Moses could not have used stronger or more energetic language, had he wished to express its universality, than we find that he does use;" yet, opposed by the legitimate deductions of geology, the language of inspiration can only be understood in a metaphorical sense. If science is permitted to interpret the one chapter metaphorically, who is to prevent her from interpreting the other in the same way; and what can be found to prevent such interpretation, if we reject the rule of St. Augustine, taken in its plain and obvious sense? Without this rule, or with it, if taken in the modified sense required for such metaphorical interpretation of the Mosaic account of the creation, what answer could be given to those who claim the right to interpret as they please whatsoever they find in holy writ that may appear more intelligible if taken metaphorically, than if taken in a proper and literal sense? These are questions that should be answered by those who defend the position to which we object. It would be childish to say we will understand the rule in one way for one chapter, and in another way for another chapter; whatever rule we adopt must be universal. If we make the modified rule universal, then the argument may be thus stated.

The words of Scripture must be taken and explained in the proper and literal sense, when nothing follows from them, so taken, either false, absurd, &c. &c.

But geology has proved that the proper and literal sense of the Mosaic account of the formation of the world is absurd; therefore we are permitted to take that account in a metaphorical sense. But

geology has also proved that the proper and literal sense of the Mosaic account of the deluge of Noah is absurd, therefore we are permitted to take that account in a metaphorical sense.

If Moses, when describing the deluge, means to describe it as an universal deluge, he falsifies the truth, since geology has proved it could not have been universal. But the language of Moses can not be understood in any other sense, therefore he falsifies the truth.

These conclusions appear to us inevitable, if we follow those who allow geologists to affix their own meaning to the words of the first chapter of Genesis. Nor do we think it would be difficult to show them, from their own premises, that consistency requires them to admit as true all the marvels of that most marvellous work, the Vestiges of Creation. To those who consider this earth only in relation to its mass, and man only in relation to the brief term of his earthly existence, our views upon these scientific subjects may be quite unintelligible, or, perchance, quite ridiculous. The influence of a narrow and contracted estimate of the grand scheme of creation is not only apparent among the few who openly avow it, but oftentimes covertly directs the reasoning of those who would indignantly resent the imputation of such sentiments. The sole end of the creation of the world, so far as man can see, was to serve as a habitation for the human race; the sole end of the creation of man was to love and serve his Creator. To discuss the question of the formation of the world, and purposely keep out of sight the end of its creation, would seem to be most unphilosophical. If we reject all such supernatural and spiritual relations of our planet, we shall have nothing left but the mere physical relations, and then, in the words of Mr. Locke, "if we see but in part, and know but in part, it is no wonder we conclude not right from our partial views." "Whence is it supposed," asks Mr. Genoude, "that God esteems things only in proportion to their mass? Man, capable of knowing and loving God, is, without doubt, greater in his eyes than all those immense bodies that roll through the celestial space. Religion teaches us, and a thousand prodigies assure us, that our globe has been sanctified by the presence and sacrifice of a man-God; that from the rising to the setting sun the divine sacrifice is, and will be offered until the end of the world; that the Son of God must again descend upon it at the end of time, in order to receive into his glory the whole church sanctified by his blood. Now those supernatural wonders, of which our earth must be the theatre, give to it a prerogative nothing could ever equal."

The errors into which Protestant geologists have been led need not surprise us until one error ceases to lead to another. Their false conclusions seem to flow naturally and necessarily from the partial views and imperfect data which they adopt as the basis of their reasoning. When men throw off all allegiance to that divinely constituted authority whose peculiar prerogative it is to guard the word and reveal the will of God, they have no longer any safeguard against delusion. Without faith their boasted reasoning powers readily lead them astray, and the more implicitly they rely upon themselves, the more widely are they likely to wander, not only in theology, but in science, and on every topic where the human intellect is compelled to search for the grain of wheat in the bushel of chaff, until at last they lose themselves, rambling, perchance, in the empyrean of some nebulous hypothesis. To examine revelation for the express purpose of making it conform to previously adopted opinions, seems to us not the most likely way to ascertain the true meaning of its Author. St. Hilary says: "He only reads with profit who expects the sense of the things said from the words, and does not impose it upon them; who does not force that to seem to be contained in the words, which, before reading, he had presumed was to be understood."

What more powerful means can be found to destroy all reverence for the word of God than to accustom ourselves to weigh, in our own false balances, the hypotheses of science against the words of Scripture, and at every turn of the beam to pronounce the sacred penman unreasonable and absurd? Who is to put limits to these hypotheses on their application, if all are allowed the right to interpret for themselves? There should be some means to arrest the evil, and in these remarks it has been our object to direct attention to what seems to us the most simple and the most effectual for the purpose. In this application of the rule of St. Augustine, taken in its plain and obvious sense, as sanctioned by the most illustrious doctors of the church for so many centuries, we have a touchstone to distinguish, in all these questions, truth and its counterfeit presentment.

Our former remarks upon this subject having been noticed in sundry friendly criticisms, we have here endeavored to reply to all the objections that have come to our knowledge, without particularizing the sources whence they emanated. Our wish having been to overturn the reasoning of our opponents, if possible, without disturbing their individual equilibrium. There is, however, one objection to which we have not adverted, and which, implying the grave charge of dishonest argumentation, should not be passed over in silence. It has been said we have not done justice to science in our former article, inasmuch as we did not represent our geological opponent sufficiently orthodox in his views, and that we made him appear as one "more determined to hold to the truth of his science in defiance of revelation, than to reconcile the speculations of geology with the written word." As we profess to draw from nature, we have merely to copy the original as accurately as possibly, and this we claim to have done, indeed the very objection made is but a compliment to our skill and fidelity. That the picture is not prettier, surely should not be imputed to us as a fault. We admit, and, at the same time, regret that geologists are seldom orthodox; nor do we see any remedy, except to hand them over to our theological friends to be converted to the one true faith, and then, with the help of St. Augustine, we do not doubt they may easily be reclaimed from their errors. But so long as they have not faith, they lack the indispensable preparative for human knowledge, and we can do nothing with them. For the benefit of those who could find neither facts nor arguments in our former article, we have taken the trouble here to reduce our reasoning, at times, to the syllogistic form, that they may have something tangible to demolish. Every thing herein offered as fact, we will endeavor to establish by unequivocal proof, if this should be necessary, and every thing offered as argument we will endeavor to substantiate, if attacked in the proper spirit; or, failing in either, we are satisfied to abide the result. The views we have expressed have been adopted only on conviction of their truth, we are ready to abandon them when convicted of error. The same assumptions heretofore made will again be found in this article, and lest any of our critics should be startled out of their propriety by the accidental discovery, we will here explicitly acknowledge them.

We assume that the rule of St. Augustine for the interpretation of Scripture must be understood in its plain and obvious sense, and must be obeyed. It must be obeyed in its obvious sense, in some modified sense, or else wholly rejected. No Catholic theologian dare reject it, as there is not the slightest authority that we can find for taking it in a modified sense except what is furnished by the bad example of some few who neglect it without adverting to it.

We assume that we know the ordinary meaning of all ordinary English words, and, therefore, can determine the proper literal meaning of the first chapter of Genesis, or at least so much of it as to

show most unequivocally that if taken thus literally it is totally irreconcilable with all approved modern systems of geology.

We assume what geologists themselves admit, that their science contradicts the proper literal Mosaic account of the formation of the world, and of the deluge. By geologists we mean practical men, those who have studied geology in the field, and not merely in the closet.

A word of apology, and we have done. The occasional repetitions in the preceding pages we regret, but could not well avoid. We have been obliged to follow wheresoever led by the arguments we have been attacking, and if at times we have retraced again and again the same path, it has been because our opponents have exhibited those staunch disputative powers commemorated by the poet:

"Even though vanquished they could argue still."

A.

INFANT BAPTISM.

TO ALBERTINE ON THE DEATH OF HER LITTLE SISTER ROSE.

"Suffer little children to come to me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God."—*Mark* x, 14.

We never mourn when early flowers
Fresh from their stems are torn,
To fling their sweets o'er festal bowers,
Or bloom, by beauty worn;
For who could shed a tear above
Their destiny of joy and love?

We never mourn when from the mine
Rich gems are torn away,
To sparkle on some princely shrine,—
Stars in the light of day,—
For feel we not this lot to be
Better than dark obscurity?

We never mourn when ocean's caves
Are searched for treasures rare;
Nor weep the trophies, from its waves,
The diver's hand may tear;
For know we not that fate will throw
Around them here a brighter glow?

Then o'er the bud which soft reposed,
In purity arrayed,
With all its tender leaflets closed
Within affection's shade,—
Why should we mourn, who know 'twas riven
From earth, to shed its sweets in heaven?

Why should we mourn, who know so well
Our gem will shine on high,
Where light, and stars, and angels dwell
Beneath the HOLY EYE—
Adding its lustre to the race
Of cherubim—God's throne to grace?

Why should we mourn the doom that wrests
From life's tumultuous wave,
The treasure dearest to our breasts,
Convinced our pearl 'twill save
From the dread sea of earthly wo,
Whose troubled billows ceaseless flow?

The faith is ours, which teacheth hope
To hearts by sorrow riven;
For have we not the means that ope
The golden gates of heaven;
The MERCY which, to save, hath sent
Each high and holy sacrament?

We know that, washed as she hath been
Before the sacred shrine,
Her spirit is released from sin,
Through love and grace divine;
The sign upon her brow impressed,
Admits our cherub 'midst the blest!

Those words of faith, that act of love,
The promise will obtain,
And ROSE within the courts above
Will brightly bloom again;
For CHRIST the solemn pledge hath given,
"Baptism makes us heirs of heaven."

Sweet babe! we shed no tear upon
The grave wherein you rest,
Nor mourn that death hath early won
Your union with the blest;
But see you in that brighter sphere,
Adorned with graces, sweet and rare.

We know that midst the glorious band
Of souls that still surround
The holy throne,—'tis yours to stand,
And hallelujahs sound;
We mourn not, then, the spirit given
Thus early to the joys of heaven.

MOÏNA.

NEW ORLEANS.

THE ABSOLVING POWER.

Power of the priest to forgive sins. Banner of the Cross: Philadelphia, February 21, 1846.

IS an unfortunate circumstance for the adversaries of the Catholic church, that they can scarcely assail any one article of our faith without finding themselves leagued in a common cause with infidelity. This is the case particularly when any question is raised about the sacrament of penance, and the power granted by Christ to his ministers on earth to forgive and retain sins. Whilst the infidels of France are publishing the most infamous productions on this subject, American as well as European Protestants run to their aid, unintentionally we hope, and endeavor to prove that the priest possesses no such power. This is the import of a certain extract from the *Church Magazine*, London, 1839, inserted in the columns, and highly praised by the editor of the *Banner of the Cross*. On what real ground, and with what prudence, justice, and truth this praise has been so liberally bestowed, will be seen in the course of our remarks. But before entering upon the subject, we must thank our neighbor for the opportunity he has afforded us of setting him right on this important topic.

To confine ourselves to the present question concerning the absolving power of priests; if the author of the *Church Magazine*, and the editor of the *Banner of the Cross*, had contented themselves with asserting that the ministers of the Episcopalian or any other Protestant denomination have no warrant or authority whatever to forgive and to retain sins, far from complaining of the position assumed, we would readily concur in maintaining it. For the possession of such an authority requires, in the first place, a valid ordination, and, secondly, a divine commission received from Christ through the apostles and their successors, both of which are wanting among Protestants. But when it is question of those to whom it was said in the persons of the first disciples: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them;"* and "Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world;"† in other words, when it is question of Catholic bishops and priests, the case is altogether different, and for this reason we shall express ourselves freely on the proposition put forth by the *Banner of the Cross*.

The author enters immediately upon the subject by quoting the following Scriptural passages:

"*Scriptures.*—God who forgiveth all thine iniquities. Ps. ciii, 3. If thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand? But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared. Ps. cxxx, 3, 4. To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him. Daniel ix, 9. Who can forgive sins but God alone? Mark ii, 7. Him (Jesus) hath God exalted with his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins. Acts v, 31. In whom (Christ) we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace. Ephes. i, 7. In whom (Christ) we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins. Col. i, 14. The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin. 1 John i, 7. I, even I am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins. Isai. xliii, 25. Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity? Micah vii, 18."—*Church Magazine.*

* John xx, 22, 23. † Matt. xxviii, 20.

Thus we are given to understand (not by the Holy Scripture, but by the *London Church Magazine*) that there is and can be no forgiving power among men, as such a power essentially resides in God alone.

Before we come to a direct and positive refutation of this extraordinary reasoning, we should like to know what answer our Anglican divine would give to a similar argument, if urged against baptism, the efficacy and necessity of which we suppose* him to admit. Put the case that he is assailed in this way: the remission of sins in baptism essentially belongs to God alone, for the Scripture says: "He it is (Christ) that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost."† "He saved us by the laver of regeneration, and renovation of the Holy Ghost."‡ "Christ loved the church, and delivered himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life."§ Therefore, as the adversary of baptism would conclude, no human being has any right or power to baptize. There is hardly a doubt but our Episcopalian opponent would give the following answer: It is true, God alone, by his supreme power and the operation of his grace, forgives sins in baptism. Yet he would have men to be his ministers in the conferring of this great sacrament of regeneration, and to concur, as active instruments, in the production of its inward effects, by baptizing in his name.

Now this is exactly the answer which the Catholic would urge for the sacrament of penance and the power of priests in reference to sins committed after baptism, as may be easily inferred from the formula of absolution which is every where used by Catholic bishops and priests in these words: "*Our Lord Jesus Christ absolve thee,* and I, *by his authority,* absolve thee, in the first place, from every bond of excommunication or interdict, as far as I have power and thou hast need: in the next place, I absolve thee from thy sins, *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Amen." This short formula evidently shows that the Catholic church intends to exercise no other power than that granted by Christ, and in no other way than in the name and by the authority of God clearly expressed no less than three times, and hence the difficulty raised by the author of the *Church Magazine* is already reduced to nothing for want of solid ground and proper application.

The writer, moreover, by adducing among other passages the 7th verse of the 2d chapter of St. Mark, betrays and defeats his own cause. In fact, this verse is not properly a Scriptural text, but a sentence uttered by certain scribes, and related by the evangelist. It does not contain the words of Christ, but those of his enemies, to whom he administered a well merited rebuke, and whom he refuted by a splendid miracle, showing that he had, even as the Son of man, power on earth to forgive sins. "Some of the scribes were sitting there, and thinking in their hearts: Who can forgive sins but God only? And Jesus presently, knowing in his spirit that they so thought within themselves, saith to them: Why think you these things in your hearts? Which is easier, to say to the sick of the palsy: Thy sins are forgiven thee, or to say: Arise, take up thy bed and walk? But that you may know that *the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins,* (he saith to the sick of the palsy,) I say to thee: Arise, take up thy bed, and go thy way into thy house. And immediately he arose, and, taking up his bed, went his way in the sight of all."* This fact presented, not in a mutilated state, but fully as it is related in the Gospel, instead of serving as a proof, leads to a perfect refutation of our opponent's doctrine.

*Should our supposition, however charitable, be groundless, and consequently leave no room for *retort*, we beg to remark that all our subsequent arguments are entirely independent of it, and, without it, preserve all their strength, as every attentive reader will easily perceive.

† John i, 33. ‡ Tit. iii, 5. § Eph. 25, 26.

* Mark ii, 6—12.

It is indeed true, and Catholics no less than Protestants admit that the primary, independent, and sovereign power of forgiving sins essentially resides in God alone. But if the Almighty is pleased to exercise it through the ministry of men set apart by himself for this purpose, who are we to oppose him, and endeavor to prevent him from doing so? The whole question, therefore, is reduced to this: whether Christ really granted to his ministers, that is, to his apostles and their successors, without restriction of time, place, and persons, power on earth to forgive sins in his name, and by this means to apply the merits of his passion to the souls of repenting sinners. Now that he has granted it, we have a full certainty from his own solemn promise and repeated asseveration.

We read in one portion of the Gospel that he said to St. Peter, "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."* The emblem of the keys manifestly implies a full authority to open and to shut the kingdom of heaven, while the words that follow still more expressly signify the power of removing all obstacles whatever that might lie in the way of salvation, and consequently the power of remitting sins, which are the first and the greatest of all these obstacles. The same grant substantially was extended to all the apostles, when our Lord said to them: "Amen, I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven."† And again, in another place, "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you.... Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose you shall retain, they are retained."‡

If the adversaries of the absolving power, after reading such testimonies, are still unconvinced, they must be very exacting indeed. Christ certainly knew, at least as well as they do, the force of the expressions which he used. If his meaning had not been to invest the priests of the new law with power to forgive sins, he had innumerable words at his command to express himself otherwise, and he never would have said: "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven." We are, therefore, not only authorized, but even compelled, by the consideration of Christ's infinite wisdom and veracity, to take these his expressions in their proper, literal, and obvious import; nor have Protestants any more right to ask us why we understand them thus, than they would have to ask a traveller why he follows the main road, and does not entangle himself in crooked and thorny paths. But we, on the other hand, have a right to wonder at the strange and forced interpretations which our separated brethren choose to adopt on this as well as on other points. We may well be allowed to express a feeling of mingled surprise and indignation at the bold confidence of a writer, who, having undertaken to treat of the absolving power, collects a multitude of Scriptural texts, expressive of the supreme authority of God, which no one calls in question, while he carefully omits all those alluding to the ministerial power of men, which is the very object of the question started by himself, and which, contrary to the express words of Christ, he thinks proper to deny.

So much for the complete failure of our writer's attempt to disprove, by Scripture, the absolving power of priests. We shall now examine whether he will be more successful in applying for support to the fathers of the church. This is the subject of his second paragraph.

"*Fathers.*—Our Saviour, therefore, forgiving his sins, both cured the man and showed manifestly who himself was.

* Matth. xvi, 19. † Matth. xviii, 18.
‡ John xx, 21, 23.

For, if none can forgive sins but God alone, and our Lord did forgive them, and cure men, it is manifest that he was the Word of God made the Son of man; and since, as man, he feels compassion for us, so, as God, he has mercy upon us, and forgives us the debt we owe to God our Creator. *Irenæus against Heretics*, lib. 5, ch. 17. When the Jews, observing only his manhood, and not being yet persuaded of his Deity, or that he was the Son of God, justly reasoned that a man could not forgive sins, but God only, he, by his reply, that the Son of man had power to forgive sins, taught them he was that only Son of man, predicted by Daniel, who received power of judging, and thereby also of forgiving sins. *Tertullian against Marcion*, lib. 4, ch. 10. It lies in God alone to bestow the things wherein the priests' service is employed. And what speak I of priests? Neither angels nor archangels can do aught in those things which are given by God, but the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost do dispense them all. The priest lendeth his tongue, and putteth to his hand. His part only is to open his mouth, but it is God who worketh all. *St. Ambrose*, 86th Homily."—*Church Magazine.*

What were the feelings of the writer in the Church Magazine when he penned these lines, whether those of secret misgiving, or unfounded expectation, we can not tell; but this we will say, without hesitation, that he has here implicated himself in the same fault which we noticed in his quotations of Scripture, that of adducing texts of the fathers which prove nothing in his favor, and of omitting many others in which the Catholic dogma is clearly asserted.

I. The three passages just quoted contain nothing of which our opponent can avail himself against us. In the first, St. Irenæus, from whose works it is taken, merely intends to show how Christ proved his divinity against the scribes, who did not acknowledge it, nearly in this manner: "You admit that God alone can forgive sins. Now, it is certain that the Son of man (himself) hath power on earth to forgive sins, (and this he soon proved by working a splendid miracle in the sight of all.) Therefore, the Son of man is truly God also." This was, in fact, an excellent argument *ad hominem;* but it is not opposed, in the least, to another truth equally certain, that our Lord attributed the forgiving power to himself, not only as God, but also as man; nor has St. Irenæus said any thing to the contrary.

It would be useless to discuss the second passage quoted in the extract from Tertullian. This passage has no authority whatever, as it is taken from the work against Marcion, which Tertullian wrote after he had become a Montanist. At that time he was no longer one of the fathers, nor even a member of the church. The Montanists, it is true, and Tertullian with them, denied to bishops and priests the power of forgiving certain heinous crimes; but we see not what advantage this can give to the writer in the Church Magazine, since the errors of those sectarians no sooner made their appearance than they were rejected and condemned by the whole church, as Eusebius testifies.* Thus the adversaries of the forgiving power may have the Montanist Tertullian on their side, but they have the whole ancient church against them, which is the very reverse of what they intended to prove.

As to the text ascribed to St. Ambrose: first, we doubt very much whether it was ever written by that holy doctor, for it is here quoted from the eighty-sixth homily, and there is no set of homilies to be found among the genuine works of St. Ambrose, published by the learned Benedictines of St. Maur, in two folio volumes. After all, whether the passage in question was written by St. Ambrose or not, it matters very little, as it contains nothing but what we ourselves have already stated, and what Catholics universally admit, that Almighty God is the primary cause of forgiveness and justification; and 2d, that he makes use of the ministry, or *service* of the priest, to produce these admirable effects, and has attached them to the words

* Eccl. Hist. b. v, ch. 17 and 19.

of absolution pronounced in his name by his minister.

Thus, of three passages adduced by our opponent, the first proves nothing in his favor; the second is rather against him, as it is drawn from the Montanist heretics, who were unanimously condemned by the ancient church; and the third, whether authentic or not, expresses our doctrine much more than his. Such are the props by which he endeavors to sustain his denial of the absolving power! What can be thought of the superstructure raised upon such a ruinous foundation? But this is not all we have to say against his doctrine; after having stripped him of his alleged authorities, we shall now proceed to assail him directly, and show how much at variance his anti-forgiving system is with the venerable unanimity of the holy fathers. He will not, we trust, reject or disregard such names as St. Cyprian, St. Hilary, St. Ephrem, St. John Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Leo the Great, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine.

St. Cyprian says: "I entreat you, my brethren, let all confess their faults, while he that has offended enjoys life, while his confession can be received, and while *the satisfaction and pardon imparted by the priests are acceptable before God.*"*

St. Hilary writes thus: "Christ has established this fixed and severe decision, that whom his apostles should bind on earth, that is, whom they should leave bound in their sins, and *whom they should loose, by receiving them, on their confession, into the grace of forgiveness*, these should be bound or loosed in heaven, according to the apostolical judgment."†

St. Ephrem: "The exalted dignity of the priesthood far surpasses our understanding, and the power of speech. *The remission of sins is not granted to mortals, except through the ministry of the priest.*"‡

St. John Chrysostom: "To the priests of the Jews it was granted, not indeed to effect, but to ascertain the cure of corporal leprosy. To the priests of the new law is granted a full power, not over the stains of the body, but over those of the soul, *not merely to ascertain, but really to effect their cure.* . . . . Priests do not only confer the sacrament of regeneration, but *they have also power to forgive subsequent sins.*"*

St. Cyril of Alexandria: "Christ, dispensing the Holy Spirit, said: *Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven, and whose you shall retain, they are retained;* though he alone is God by nature, and has the power of releasing the guilty from their sin. How, then, or why did he impart to his disciples a power which belongs to the divinity alone? It seemed good to him that they who had within themselves his divine Spirit, *should likewise possess the power of forgiving sins*, and of retaining such as they judged proper; that Holy Spirit himself, according to his good pleasure, forgiving and retaining, through the ministry of men."†

St. Leo the Great: "The Mediator of God and men conferred this power on the rulers of the church, to impart the action of penance to those who confess their sins, and to admit them, when purified by a wholesome satisfaction, through the gate of reconciliation, to the participation of the sacraments. Our Saviour is himself ever present to this work, *the ministration of which he committed to his disciples*, saying: *And I am with you all days, even to the end of the world.*"‡

We call the attention of the reader particularly to the words of St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, not only on account of the great authority of these two illustrious fathers, but chiefly because the writer in the Church Magazine, as will presently be seen, in the third paragraph of his extract has had the inconceivable boldness, or committed the inconceivable blunder, to mention them as favorable to his cause.

St. Ambrose, writing against the Nova-

* De Lapsis. † Comm. in cap. xviii Matth. ‡ De Sacerdotio.

* De Sacerd. lib. iii, cap. 5. † In Joann. lib. xii. ‡ Ep. 83, al. 91.

tians,—who, like the Montanists, denied to the church the power of forgiving grievous crimes, and like them, also, were immediately condemned by the whole church,*—speaks thus in his treatise on penance: "They pretend that they show great respect to Jesus Christ, by reserving to him alone the power of remitting sins; and in this very thing they dishonor him, by violating his commands, and rejecting his proffered office. For, as Christ in his Gospel said: *What things you shall bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven, and what you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven;* who is it that honors him most, he that obeys, or he that rejects his commands? The church, by *binding and loosing sins,* obeys in both. The Novatians content themselves with binding only, and will not loose sinners, though *the power of doing both was given;* whence it follows that the one can not be permitted without the other. Both are allowed to the church; neither is allowed to heretics, because it is a right conceded to priests only. This right the church justly claims to herself, since she alone possesses true priests." Again: "*It seemed impossible that sins should be remitted by penance; but Christ has granted this power to his apostles, and from the apostles it has passed to the priests.*"†

St. Augustine has the following words: "Man, bound in the chains of so many grievous crimes, still draws back, and hesitates to have recourse to the keys of the church, *by which he may be loosed on earth, to the end that he be loosed in heaven.* Let him, then, now whilst he has it in his power, willingly judge himself, and reform his manners; lest, when he shall not be able to do it, he be, against his will, judged by the Lord. And when he shall have passed on himself a severe, but medicinal sentence, *let him come to the priests, by whom, in the church, the keys are administered.*" And again: "Let no one say: I do penance in secret; I do it before God; he knows my heart, and will pardon me. Was it then said without reason: *what you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed in heaven?* Were the keys given to the church for no purpose? Shall we frustrate the Gospel, shall we frustrate the words of Christ?"* These are the fathers whom our Episcopalian opponent has ventured to adduce in support of his anti-Catholic system.

As the power of priests to forgive sins is as well proved from tradition as from Scripture, and is a divine truth clearly taught by the church from the earliest ages of Christianity, it might appear incredible that any one, laying claim to theological learning, should venture to call it an error, and should attempt to show when the belief of it was introduced among Christians. Our opponent, however, has not been afraid to do this. We will not undertake to qualify either his appellation or his attempt; we might disregard them altogether, since, from what has been said, both fall of themselves to the ground. Lest, however, the writer in the Church Magazine, or his admirer, the Banner of the Cross, should complain that the debt of refutation which we owe them has not been paid in full, it will not be amiss to answer them more particularly, and to show to what inaccuracies and sophisms some authors may be driven by the desire of supporting a bad cause.

The extract in question runs thus:

"*Error when introduced.*—Absolution by the priest was declared by all the old doctors to be declarative only of God's act, as we learn from Gabriel Biel, who flourished A. D. 1480. But Suarez, the Jesuit, says, 'this opinion is false, and *now at this time* erroneous.' Yet, in the 16th century, Hadrian VI says, 'The most approved divines were of this mind, that the keys of the priesthood do NOT extend themselves to *the remission of the fault.*' In this sentiment the sovereign pontiff did certainly not err. The power of the priest to absolve from sin was an error first held by the Donatists, a set of heretics, against which opinion of theirs both St. Ambrose

* See Euseb. Hist. b. vi, c. 44.
† De Pœnit. lib. i et ii, cap. 2.

* Serm. 351, n. 9, and 393, n. 3.

and St. Augustine wrote in the very strongest terms. These saints decidedly *protested* against this monstrous error."—*Church Mag.*

I. One would think, from the beginning of this paragraph, that it would tell us the precise date, year, and century when the alleged innovation was made in the doctrine of the church, regarding the absolving power. But this is by no means the case. Our author is much more liberal and enlarged in his views than we could suppose. Instead of being so particular, he allows us to choose any epoch we may like in the interval which separates the Donatists, sectarians of the fourth, from Suarez, a doctor of the sixteenth century! How much more narrow-minded are our Catholic divines, who, in refuting any adversary, carry their subtilty so far as to point out, with undeniable accuracy, not only the century, but the very year, place, and other circumstances of the religious innovations brought about by their opponents!

II. As the belief of the forgiving power is so confidently stated to be of recent origin, and called a *monstrous error*, it must certainly have given rise to *monstrous disturbances* at the time of its introduction into the church. For such disturbances have always been excited by novel sects and doctrines, among others, by the *so-called reformation;* although *this* does not, of course, appear a monstrous error to either the Church Magazine or the Banner of the Cross. Still, our two editors relate none of these things on the subject of the forgiving power. The reason is that they found none to have ever happened, and because the supposed innovation which has sprung up in their prolific imaginations, never took place in the Catholic church.

III. It is true that some of the medieval theologians considered the sentence of absolution pronounced by the priest, in the light of a declaratory sentence, or authoritative voucher of the pardon granted by our Lord to the repenting sinner. But, on the one hand, this their manner of explaining the power of priests essentially differs from the belief of Protestants on the same subject, and can not be invoked by them with any sort of advantage. On the other, if this was at a time the opinion of some theologians, it never was the doctrine of the church.

In the first place, the opinion of those theologians essentially differs from that of Protestants, Episcopalians, and others. The latter do not believe the absolution of the priest to be indispensably required, nor to be productive of any inward and supernatural effect, nor penance to be a sacrament, nor confession to be a divine command. Whereas the divines just mentioned admitted that absolution is a judicial sentence on the part of the priest, and a necessary act in behalf of the penitent; that the contrition of the repenting sinner, however perfect and intense, can not justify him, without a sincere and at least implicit will, to have recourse, in compliance with Christ's injunction, to the power of the keys in order to be absolved; that the exercise of this power in his behalf, besides being an authoritative voucher of the remission of his sins, increases in him the gift of sanctifying grace; in fine, that penance is a sacrament, and confession a strictly binding duty. All this doctrine is certainly much more opposed than favorable to the Protestant system.

After all this manner of considering priestly absolution in the light of a declaratory, though judicial, sentence, though it may have found credit with some theologians for a time, never was the doctrine of the Catholic church. It is a very common illusion with Protestant controvertists to imagine, or at least affect to believe, that we Catholics receive as so many revealed truths whatever is said by some of our divines. This way of building up a creed, that is, by the assertion of a few individuals, is no doubt in full use among our separated brethren; having rejected and discarded the divine authority vested

by Christ in the pastors of his church,* it is necessary that they should fall under the control of merely human and fallible guidance. But it is not so with us. Our rule or guide of faith is not the opinion of a more or less considerable number of theologians, even though they were prebendaries, archdeacons, or, like the author of the *Church Magazine*, chaplains of some royal majesty; but it is the Word of God himself, propounded to us by the church, and by the unerring authority of her chief pastors. If, therefore, our adversaries wish to prove any thing to the point, let them show that the church made the opinion above stated at any time her own doctrine. But they do not even attempt, at least seriously, to do so. What is said of Hadrian VI is a mere delusion. The words quoted from him (supposing them to be faithfully translated) were written long before he was Pope Hadrian VI, and whilst he was yet professor at Louvain. Whatever, then, may have been his real opinion on our subject, it was merely the opinion of a private doctor or theologian, which we are fully allowed to reject, if you think proper, and our opponent, by producing it in a different light, has merely shown either his own deficiency in accurate knowledge, or his want of candor.

IV. To conclude this part of our discussion, it is by no means true that "absolution by the priest was declared *by all the old doctors* to be declarative only of God's act." If Gabriel Biel, a theologian of the fifteenth century, has ever said it, (which is the more to be doubted as our author does not presume to cite any words from him,) Gabriel Biel was, as well as himself, greatly mistaken. For, independently of the ancient fathers, whose explicit testimonies in our favor we have already produced, we may adduce here, *ad superabundantiam juris*, St. Bernard, St. Thomas Aquinas, and other eminent doctors of the middle ages.

St. Bernard, the celebrated abbot of Clairvaux, speaks thus in his sermon on St. Peter and St. Paul: "Who is more powerful (on earth) than he who has received the keys of the kingdom of heaven in so peculiar a manner, *that the sentence of Peter precedes the sentence of heaven?*"* It would be just the reverse, if absolution were merely a declaratory sentence of the remission of sins.

St. Thomas Aquinas, the angelic doctor, says: "God alone, by his own authority, absolves from sin, and remits sin; *priests, however, do the same as his ministers,* inasmuch as the words of the priest instrumentally operate in this as in the other sacraments, by virtue of the divine power."† This text is too clear to need any comment.

Richard St. Victor, one of the most illustrious theologians of the twelfth century, has left a whole treatise on the power of binding and loosing, in which, among other things, he says: "If the penitent neglect to look for a priest, in order to make his confession to him and receive absolution from him, *he shall not escape eternal misery.*"‡ How could that be true, if the absolution given by the priest were *declarative only of God's act?* Would not the act of God be valid without this declaration?

Hugh of St. Victor, who lived about the same time, and acquired such renown for his learning that he was called a second Augustine, asks in his second book on the sacraments, what is meant by these words of St. James, *confess your sins one to another, and pray for one another, that you may be saved;* and he answers: "They mean: confess, not only to God, but also to man for God's sake; confess to one another, that is, the sheep to the pastors, inferiors to superiors, those who have sins *to those who have the power of remitting sins.*"§

To these names might be added those

* See Matt. xxviii, 18—20.—Luke x, 16.—John xx, 21.—Eph. iv, 10—14, etc.

* Serm. i, in fest. SS. Petri et Pauli, apost. n. 2.
† Summ. Theol. Part. iii, Q. 84, art. 3, ad 3.
‡ Tract. de potest. lig.
§ Lib. ii, De Sacram. fidei.

of St. Anselm, Peter of Blois, Scotus, Paludanus, etc. But enough, we think, has been said to overturn completely the position taken by our opponent in reference to the opinion of ancient theologians: he is wrong *et quoad jus et quoad factum.*

V. We now come to the last, though not the least inaccuracy of the extract whose contents we are discussing. It is that which absurdly—I had almost said impiously—ascribes the origin of the dogma and belief of the forgiving power to the Donatists, sectarians of the fourth century. Those heretics, far from introducing a tenet which, long before them, had been delivered by Christ himself, and always admitted in the church, (see, above, our proofs taken from Scripture and tradition,) rather indirectly assailed it, at least to a certain extent, by denying that sinners can validly administer a sacrament. This was the error against which St. Augustine and other contemporary fathers wrote in the very strongest terms, but not against the forgiving power of priests, which they, on the contrary, as we have abundantly shown, very strongly vindicated in different parts of their writings.

Hence the author of the Church Magazine, by daring to accuse Catholics of a monstrous error, has only proved that, if there is any such monster here, it exists no where else than in his imagination, and that it is not the Catholic church which ought to be charged with a monstrous error, but he himself who has become guilty of a monstrous misrepresentation or monstrous mistake.

What shall we say now of the encomium bestowed on that author by the editor of the Banner of the Cross, in these words: "They" (the articles of the Church Magazine relative to the church of Rome) "were deemed to be so valuable as to obtain for them a recommendation that they should be printed for extensive and gratuitous distribution?" All we can say is, that the encomium does no credit either to the giver or to the receiver. It is not certainly to the credit of our American fellow editor to have spoken in such high terms of a work so full of inaccuracies and false reasonings. Nor do his praises render the work in any wise more respectable; nay, we think that the circumstance which he mentions concerning it redounds entirely to its dishonor. For what other reason was "a recommendation obtained for its controversial articles, that they should be printed for extensive and gratuitous distribution," except that they had very little of intrinsic merit, and were hardly worth and fit to be circulated in any other way?

After all, we very easily understand the cause of the many attacks that are directed against the forgiving power of priests. It is because the admission of that power involves the admission of the necessity of *auricular confession;* a name too odious and unpleasant for those whose heart is set upon the things of this world much more than upon the things of heaven, not to experience, from various quarters, a violent opposition. This is, no doubt, the reason which induces many, under the pretence of defending the rights of Almighty God, to attack the obvious import of his words, to deny the effect of his sovereign will, and reject the dispensations of his mercy.

To conclude: if, in the course of this article, we have occasionally used strong language, we hope that it will be attributed, not to any ill will towards our opponents, but to a just feeling of indignation at their unjustifiable assaults. Whilst they assail us and our doctrines, not only without reason, but against all reason, they can not expect that we should be like "dumb dogs, not able to bark,"* especially as we have so many means to defend our cause, and hurl back every charge successfully against them. If they want to avoid the like inconvenience in future, let them look to themselves, and no longer lose their time in looking for errors —especially for monstrous errors—in the church of Rome.

*Is. lvi, 10.

MISSIONS OF CANADA.

(From the Annals of the Propagation of the Faith.)

MERICA, with its savages, offers a scene calculated to engage the attention of penetrating and profound minds, as well as it has occupied the imagination of the many; but ever since the cold calculations of trade and colonization have taken possession, in a great measure, of North America, the kind of charm which was connected with its forests, the vast inheritance of an almost mysterious race, has disappeared, and this great phenomenon has been unattended to by science and philosophy, as well as by the curiosity of the public.

Other causes, such as the obscurity of local traditions, have also tended to turn away the mind of Europe from every thing that could interest it in regard to the primitive man of the new world; and it may be that even the church itself does not, in the history of its great apostolic enterprises, find that account which the missions of Canada are entitled to.

I do not pretend to throw any light on a subject which is but little known, but I dwell in the country of the former people of America; it is but little changed. I see their descendants scattered around me; they are still savages; they are still, almost all of them, out of the way of salvation; and, consequently, when I seek to obtain the knowledge which a missionary requires, the past must necessarily be blended with the present in my studies, and the one of them be shown forth and explained by the other.

I shall, in the first place, tell you what are those wrecks of nations towards which we have been sent. In the diocesses of Quebec and Montreal, which comprise Lower Canada, there are to be met with savages of three or four principal tribes. They almost all roam about towards the north, far away from those places where there is a beginning of civilization. Being few in number, they are becoming every day weaker and weaker from the effects of extreme want.

Upper, or West Canada, is divided into two diocesses: the diocess of Kingston, and that of Toronto. The former contains only about a thousand savages: it is in the other that those for whom our mission was established dwell. They are more than nine thousand.

Two languages, the Iroquois and the Algonkin, form the great line of distinction between the Indian races of this country. The former, called by the English the Mohawk tongue, is that of the Six Nations, settled since 1776, on the Great River, or River Ouse, which empties itself into Lake Erie. It was five of these nations that formed heretofore that confederation, which the bloody defeats of so many savage tribes, and the misfortune of New France, have rendered famous. They were formerly called the *Five Iroquois Cantons.* Here are the names which were given them by the French: the Agnins, the Oncyouthes, the Onontaguas, the Guyogouins, and the Tsonnonthouans. Now-a-days the English call them the Mohawks, the Oneidas, the Onondagas, the Cayagas, and the Senecas. These tribes inhabited the country which is now the state of New York, towards the northwest, and chiefly along Lake Ontario. As the greater number of them remained faithful to England during the war of independence, George III granted them a considerable extent of territory on the banks of the river Ouse. The others, after having sold all they possessed, went to settle themselves for the most part in the neighborhood of a bay on Lake Michi-

gan, called Green Bay; they are known by the name of the New York Indians.

These Iroquois, whom we may call the Romans of North America, used sometimes to incorporate with themselves the vanquished nations. One from among them has preserved its name; that of the Tuscaroras. This is the reason why they are now called the Six Nations. I visited them last year: I traversed the banks of the Great River. These people amount to two thousand three hundred souls; and out of this number two thousand are still infidels: they have preserved the sacrifice of the white dog.

With regard to civilization, their progress is almost none. In a few years no savages will be any longer seen on the fertile and picturesque banks of the Great River; they are removing, and the government wishes them to remove far away from it. Such are the Iroquois of the present day. The name which they derive from their ancestors makes the other savages tremble still, while the degradation to which they are reduced fills the traveller with amazement and pity. How God has visited on their children the iniquity of their fathers! Is this sufficient? Does not the blood of martyrs also cry out for mercy? and shall there not be among these barbarian tribes, as formerly, at least a few chosen souls? We hope so, and beseech the Lord to send and to fill with his Spirit those for whom this work has been appointed.

The other language of which I have spoken has no connection with the Iroquois. It is almost general from Hudson's Bay to the Rocky Mountains: it is the language of trade. There are several dialects of it, but not much unlike. We call it the Algonkin, although the people of that name, in all probability, speak only a dialect of it.

I shall mention here only the two great classes, in which the English and the Americans include almost all the Indian tribes who speak the Algonkin: these are the Ottawas and the Chippeways. These are the savages who, together with the Mohawks, are to be found in Upper Canada, and form a population of more than ten thousand souls. There are about eight thousand in the state of Michigan in the diocess of Detroit.

The English government has divided those who are under its power into superintendencies. There is an Indian office which administers the produce of the lands sold to the crown. The annual income arising from this source is appropriated to the building of churches, schools, and houses, which the savages oftentimes refuse to take. It serves also for what are called *presents*, that is, for a yearly distribution of arms and ammunition, knives, blankets, and some pieces of cloth.

It was not until the year 1830 that sectarian missionaries, seeking to convert the savages, were seen in Upper Canada. These missionaries were Methodists. With much ado have they been able to found three very trifling establishments. But by means of their excursions and their camp-meetings they have obtained an influence which has become in some places a great obstacle, the only obstacle, strickly speaking, which Protestantism offers us: for, with all its resources, the church of England is not a dangerous rival. We only ask from it liberty, which, moreover, is secured to us by the most solemn treaties.

I can not tell what the Catholic religion did for more than a century for these poor savages of Upper Canada, at a time when they were much more numerous than they are at present, and, in general, when they took a pleasure in calling to mind the *blackgowns*. The diocess had not a sufficient number of apostles to send among them. It is now only seven years since the Rev. Mr. Proulx, a Canadian priest, first reopened an Indian mission and settled in the great Manitooline. At last, after many events, we, whom Providence hath called, feel now happy at finding the gate open for us. I must say a few words on our views, our de-

sires, and on the work which we have begun.

Sandwich is a parish containing almost all French Canadians. Eighteen years ago it was divided into two. Sandwich and Amherstburg are the only parishes in this part of Upper Canada, which is a mission country. Sandwich and the city of Detroit, the capital of the state of Michigan, were originally nothing more than two villages of the savages. The Jesuits had collected there the Catholic Hurons, who did not go down to Quebec after that bloody catastrophe which, along with famine, destroyed almost entirely that powerful tribe. The last missionary, Father Pothier, died in 1781. His successors were the priests of Quebec. But before that time, towards the latter days of Father Pothier, almost all the Hurons had gone away.

This parish, called formerly the assumption of Detroit, at the same time that it affords us an important exercise of our ministry among Catholics of French descent, and the Irish of the neighborhood, has become the advanced post from which we can issue forth to meet the savage tribes who are awaiting us.

Sandwich is situated at the distance of nine miles from Lake Saint Clair, and seventy-four from Lake Huron, on the left bank of the Detroit River. The first mission which we have founded is an island, at the entrance of Lake Saint Clair, called South Island or Walpole Island. This island is inhabited only by Indians. Although they are a mixture of different nations, these savages are wonderfully united by a spirit of nationality, of which we find no example elsewhere. They are proud of being the only people of the Red Skins who have remained faithful to the customs of their ancestors. Being, in consequence, enemies of every thing which has the appearance of Christianity, they foster and strengthen their natural aversion for prayer and even for civilization by the habitual practice of jugglery or savage magic. During the space of nearly a year that we have been in Walpole Island, the Lord has sent us many trials, but he has not left us without consolations.

At the distance of twenty-five miles from Walpole Island near Lake Huron, is what they call an *Indian Reserve*, that is, a certain extent of land which the government has left to the savages. This reserve consists of four square miles of ground on the left bank of the river Saint Clair. The Methodists have there established a mission ever since 1831. There, every year, in the month of September or October, are renewed in a camp-meeting the shoutings and contortions of the most fanatical of all sects. There, nevertheless, God has also given us a small flock of neophytes.

From Port Sarnia to the largest of the islands of Lake Huron, called Mantooaleen or Manitooline, the distance is about two hundred miles. This island belongs to the savages. The number of those who inhabit it amounts to eleven hundred. There are five villages. In one of them only are seen well-built cottages, a church, a school, workshops; it is that village where the church of England has collected all her converts. They are not more than one hundred and sixty, although lodgings and other bounties are given to any one who will become a Protestant. The Catholics receive nothing, and are nearly seven hundred in number, notwithstanding. Extensive, fertile, and in an admirable situation for the savages, the great Manitooleen may be regarded as a land of promise, to which the Lord calls the scattered and wandering tribes of the Algonkins. It would seem as if their misfortunes have made them send up to heaven a long cry of distress, which has touched the heart of God.

Since 1648, the time when the Jesuits founded their first mission at Manitooleen, how many changes have taken place in either hemisphere! And the great isle of Lake Huron has nothing changed! Its shores, its forests, have preserved their

primitive beauty, and it is the old American race that inhabits it still. The showy steamboats and the proud ships of war that plough the waters of Lake Huron have not as yet visited it. It likes and receives only the small bark, the tree hollowed into a canoe, and the skiff made of its rind.

In the month of July, the season of the *presents*, you see canoes arrive in hundreds from every side, but particularly from Lake Superior. There are soon erected tents, and huts of reeds or of branches of trees, and two or three principal camps appear on the picturesque shores of some bay. You perceive, it is true, here and there, some men and things which bespeak civilization, but it is only like a weak contrast to what is all around them. The grand sight shown here is savage life in time of peace and on its solemn days. Then the *blackgown* can, according as it seems well to him, walk up and down about these camps, go into the huts and sit down on the mat of the chief; he can enter into chat, preach, make himself all to all, a savage even, in order to gain the savages. One thing, however, is wanting to him, and a material thing it is—time; for as soon as the distribution of the presents is over, this crowd disperses. Still it is easy to understand the good effects which the sacred ministry may produce in so large a gathering of people.

Last year Father Choné was present at it, along with the Rev. Mr. Proulx. He had just come from Sandwich. Since then this missionary has never ceased laboring, and not unfruitfully, among his dear islanders, whether Catholics or infidels. Being destitute of almost every thing, he seems to feel no other want than that of having fellow laborers, because he sees what may be hoped for, and what is to be done. The Lord will undoubtedly soon send him some spiritual and temporal aid; his flock will go on increasing, and the great Manitooleen will become the centre of the missions which we have to found. Such is our hope.

On the subject of those missions which we contemplate founding I have to remark that his lordship, the bishop of Detroit, in concert with the bishop of Toronto, is calling us to the *Sauts-de-Sainte-Marie*, where our fathers had formerly a flourishing congregation. I shall add that the same prelate is also pressing us to go to Lake Superior, that he is pointing out to us the place where we should settle, and that he is bringing before our view, along with some neophytes, a crowd of infidels, to whom it is out of his power to send any missionary. With the invitation of his lordship, the bishop of Detroit, all our desires correspond; for the missions of which I have just spoken, though, being of importance in themselves, will become more so by means of those others which will continue the chain of the missions: they are to lead us very far onward. When we were pitching our tent last year on the shores of Lake Superior, we were already thinking of carrying it over to the shore of some one of the bays of the greatest lake in the world, right opposite that immense extent of forests, prairies, and lakes, which stretch as far as the Rocky Mountains.

This thought, these wishes, are inseparable from our undertaking, and are imperatively required by the circumstances of it; for, in point of fact, the best preserved and most numerous Indian tribes are scattered over that immense west which lies towards Lake Superior. The greater number of them have never had any Catholic missionaries, and for a considerable time past they have been visited by Methodist preachers. When a person fixes his mind on this thought, he does not require much zeal in order to have his bowels of compassion moved by it.

CORPUS CHRISTI.

BY JOHN AUGUSTUS SHEA.

Sun of the morn! that from the eastern hills
Awakes the world, and earth with glory fills,
I love to see thy bannered light unrolled,
To see the conscious ocean pride in thee,
Beauty and life adorn each flower and tree,
And every dew-drop turned to liquid gold!

But with more sacred gladness do I now
Behold in heaven the splendor of thy brow,
Bringing to man this morn of jubilee,
Inviting us the bread of life to share,—
To love's own altar-banquet to repair,
And read, with faith, the living mystery!

O mystery! not mystic to the eye
Whose light is faith in Him beyond the sky—
Faith not of earth, but born of God above—
The mystery which inner life proclaims,
And with its photographic truth inflames
Upon the heart the image of his love.

Truth of the sacrament to faith revealed,
In strictly human elements concealed
From mortal eye! Fulness of love divine!
Feast of the faithful! Fulness of the Lord!
Of justice Justifier! God's award!
I bow in tears before thy mercy's shrine.

Who, of this day contemplative, can look
On sunrise, opening like a mystic book
Written by truth, nor see the promised morn
When by this banquet strengthened he can rise
From the deep night of death, and tread the skies
In heaven's broad sunshine soaringly reborn!

Descending from the twelve, from hour to hour
Of eighteen hundred years of growing power,
From where the fragrant groves of Ispahan
From the propaganda's voice of truth receive,
Listen, love, reverence, exult, believe,
To where Columbia hails the free-born man.

Descending through the twelve, pure as when first
The sunlight of the Word from darkness burst
Is Rome's high Catholicity of sway;
Humble and pure—north, south, and east, and west
The rock built church haileth, in every breast,
The *Corpus Christi* of salvation's day.

Glory to God that spareth me to see
Throughout the earth this wondrous unity,
  Its source the Saviour, and its centre Rome!
Marking on history's page, with pen sublime,
The proud, triumphant age of Christian time,
  And guiding man to his celestial home.

Here sacrifice and sacrament unite;
The mortal's anguish and the Godhead's might,
  The real, not the type of saving grace;
Let us, to-day, regenerated be,
Fulfil the faith, bend the repentant knee,
  And, true in spirit, seek God's holy place.

Let us believe, adore, love, hope and pray,
Let faith on wings expansive hail this day,
  Surmount the clouds, and soar beyond the sun;
And into heaven presume, and drop one tear
Of the pure, humbled heart's repentance there,
  And see the goal of promise won.

INTELLIGENCE.

FOREIGN.

ENGLAND.—*Conversions.*—The Rev. Edward Healy Thompson, M. A., late curate of Ramsgate, Kent, and heretofore of St. James, Westminster, and St. Marylebone, London, was received into the church at Salisbury on Saturday, the 11th April, being Easter eve.

A correspondent of the *London Morning Herald* states that the Rev. Mr. Wells, curate of the church at St. Martin-in-the-Fields, had resigned his living, and entered into the Catholic church.

The *Dorset Chronicle* says that the Anglican clergyman at Bath had resigned his charge for the purpose of entering into the communion of the Catholic church.

The *Church and State Gazette* says the Rev. J. M. Jephson, with his lady, have at last given in their full submission to the "bishopric of St. Peter."

On Tuesday last, says the *Liverpool Standard*, the Rev. William Howell Lloyd was received into the church of Rome at the chapel of the bishop's house at Birmingham. A few days before, a gentleman of distinction from Scotland also made profession of faith in the same chapel.

At Kensington chapel last week four converts (ladies and gentlemen) were received into the church by the Rev. W. Rugden.

One of the clergy of the London District has lately assured a correspondent that scarcely a day passes without a conversion in his district.

The *Messager de Denube* announces the simultaneous conversion of three countesses of Rechberg to the Catholic faith. Their abjuration took place on 4th of March at Donzdorf and at Munich.

A correspondent of the *Tablet*, from the Island of Jersey, writes that the Rev. Mr. Cunningham received *thirteen* converts into the church at Vauxhall, at Easter.

Mr. Joseph Evans, a native of England, was received into the Catholic church, at the parochial chapel of St. Nicholas, Galway, Ireland, on the 7th April.

The *Church and State Gazette* states that Robert Walker, Esq., M. A., of Lincoln college, Oxford, has conformed to the Roman Catholic faith.

Robert Monteith, Esq., jr., of Carstairs, was received into the church on the festival of St. Joseph (19th March) at Oscott college, and on the festival of the Annunciation of our

Lady (25th March), his lady was received into the church at the convent of St. Margaret, Edinburg, on which occasion the inmates of that establishment made the customary annual renewal of their vows.— *Tablet*.

Rio Janeiro.—A correspondent has kindly favored us with the following information, which we take pleasure in placing before our readers.

Now, while I have room, I will give you some idea of our churches at Rio Janeiro. Know then that they are neither Gothic nor Grecian, nor Saracenic. I can not make out any thing certain, as every church has something peculiar. The steeple part of the churches is sometimes covered with glazed Dutch tiles, of different colors, producing thus rather a singular effect. The colors, being strongly relieved by each other, may be seen at a great distance. Blue and white are the most generally used. The spires are, in general, Saracenic in their origin, many of them perfect minarets. The bells are hung below these spires. By the way, don't forget to ask ——— about the bell-ringing. We boarded opposite the church of the Carmo, and didn't we have a benefit on Sundays and festas. I 'll continue: the churches are constructed of cut stone, resembling somewhat red sandstone; it appears to be much harder than the stone of St. Joseph's. The façades are very much worked, and the work is equal to any thing I ever saw. Festoons of flowers, angels, alto-relievos over the entrance, capitals of *pilasters* are fit for any church; the work that is expended upon them is tremendous. The windows are very ordinary, resembling a great deal those of a private house; there are a number of that kind of windows, through which "*Quasimodo*" put his head. They appear to be air-holes, for there is no glass in them. The Candelaria is the leading church for the architectural beauty of exterior. The interiors of churches are frequently very rich. There is an immense quantity of carving, and beautifully finished too. Around the altars it is the richest, and the amount of labor expended must have been prodigious. It is, moreover, no mean production; the men who worked the spiral column with alto-relievos, and decorated *every square inch* of timber around and above the altars with festoons and perforated work, must have understood thoroughly their business. The carving is in the style of Louis XIV; there you have an idea of it. They have done here one thing, which, perhaps, the climate obliged them to do; they have covered all the wood work with thick coats of white. I have not seen a piece of naked carving in any of the churches that I have visited. The side altars are numerous. Above them invariably are statues of the patron saints in niches, and colored after life. Some of the statues of our Saviour that I have seen are frightful from the natural manner of the coloring. At every joint, and all over the body, are horrible wounds, very well imitated. However, the thing appears to be in very bad taste; it is entirely overdone. Of what substance these statues are composed, I have not ascertained. The carving, if they are carved, is not good; it is too soft. There are some churches very rich; silver lamps and candlesticks, silver flower vases are abundant. At the Carmo I saw an antependium of solid silver.

I will now speak of the church of the monastery of San Bento, and that of the Dominican convent, San Antonio I believe is the name. The monasteries are large and strongly built. They are situated on the top of a hill in the city. The San Bento is the richest convent in the Brazils. The monks are few. The churches of these two monasteries are the richest I ever saw or ever expect to see. I was with ——— when I entered the San Bento for the first time. Till then I could not have thought it possible for so much labor to be spent on a church. I never imagined such richness. The exterior is very plain and without the slightest pretension to architectural beauty, or beauty of any sort. You expect nothing, when on a sudden you behold the interior of the church. From the door to the altar, from the ceiling to the pavement, it is nothing but carving; this is not like the other of which I have spoken. Every bit of this is *gilded*, and not only gilded, but *burnished*. It appears to be nothing but gold. The ceiling is covered with paintings, which are very badly done, and mar greatly the effect of the other parts. There is one of the side chapels (our Lady's) of which there is not the *smallest portion* of the wall or ceiling visible for the gold. This chapel is more than half the size of *our little chapel*. The lamps are of massive silver, and three or four feet high. I never saw such magnificence. The other convent church is almost as rich as this. I was in the latter church on All Saints' waiting for mass. In

entering I saw a monk standing among the candles of the high altar. From the foot of the large crucifix to the tabernacle is an inclined space of six or seven feet; this space is filled with candles. Among these candles the monk was standing with his back to the people, apparently engaged in arranging some of them. I waited and waited for him to come down, but there he stayed, and is there I suspect to the present moment. It was a statue dressed like a monk of the order with shaved head, &c. &c. It appeared to me to be in very bad taste to stick a statue among the candles.

M.

DOMESTIC.

Archdiocess of Baltimore.—*The Provincial Council.*—The sixth provincial council of Baltimore was opened on Sunday the 10th ult., and was closed on the Sunday following, the 17th. The opening ceremonies were grand and imposing, beyond any thing ever before witnessed in the United States. No less than twenty-three bishops were in attendance from all parts of the union. The venerable Bishop Flaget, of Louisville, now in the eighty-third year of his age, was necessarily absent on account of infirmity, and the Right Rev. Bishop of Boston was not present by reason of serious sickness; but both of these sees were represented by the respective coadjutors of the prelates just named. The Right Rev. Dr. Blanchet, vicar apostolic of Oregon, did not attend in consequence of the great distance of his residence from Baltimore; and this remote territory was the only portion of our union which was not ecclesiastically represented on the occasion.

The Catholicity of the church was strikingly and beautifully shadowed forth by this harmonious reunion of prelates born in different nations, but professing the same holy faith, kneeling at the same holy altar, and uniting with heart and soul in the same great work of governing the church of God, "which he had purchased with his blood." Of the twenty-three prelates in attendance, we remarked that *eight* were natives of the United States, *seven* of Ireland, *six* of France, one of Switzerland, and another of Belgium; and yet all distinctions of nation were lost in the great unity of faith and worship in which all hearts were blended together as one.

On no previous occasion, perhaps, in all our life, have we been more deeply impressed with the peculiar grandeur and sublimity of our ceremonial, when it is fully carried out according to the magnificent scale on which it was planned. Never can we forget our own feelings on witnessing that long and imposing line of procession of priests and bishops—beginning with young clerks following the cross, and closing with the archbishop—which slowly moved around the square on which the Cathedral stands, from the front of the archbishop's residence to the front of the Cathedral, chanting the *Miserere*, and imploring the divine benediction on the deliberations of the bishops. These were all dressed in cope and mitre, and took their place in the procession according to the date of their ordination. A vast concourse of people, both Catholics and Protestants, looked on with breathless interest, while this largest assemblage of prelates and clergymen ever convened in this union was solemnly wending its way to the Cathedral entrance. No one, we are quite confident, no matter how deeply prejudiced against our holy church, could fail to be deeply and favorably impressed by the spectacle; and the profound silence preserved, together with the apparent reverence manifested by all present, proved that some feeling, higher than mere curiosity and politeness, pervaded the bosoms of all spectators.

As the head of the procession entered the cathedral the orchestra in the gallery struck up a splendid march, which was most effectively executed by a full band. After the prelates and clergy had taken their respective places in the sanctuary, a solemn high mass was celebrated by the Most Rev. Archbishop, after which the council was opened with the usual prayers and ceremonies as directed by the pontifical. The choir performed one of the most brilliant masses of Mozart with an ability and a success which reflected great credit on the members. At the end of the mass, the Right Rev. Dr. Purcell, of Cincinnati, ascended the pulpit, and delivered an able and eloquent discourse on the power of teaching all nations, imparted by Christ to the apostles and their successors, and in answer to many popular charges often alleged against the church. In the evening of the same day, after vespers, a discourse was delivered on the antiquity of the church by the Very Rev. M. J. Spalding.

On the evenings of the week ensuing, able and eloquent discourses were delivered by the

right reverend bishops of New York, Pittsburg, Philadelphia, and Cincinnati, and by the Right Rev. Dr. McClosky, bishop coadjutor of New York. On Thursday a solemn mass of *requiem*, for the repose of the prelates and clergy of the province, deceased since the last council, was sung by the Right Rev. Bishop of Natchez, and the *Libera*, at the close of it, was chanted, the Most Rev. Archbishop presiding. After the mass, the bishop of St. Louis preached a very eloquent and appropriate sermon on the antiquity, divine origin, and utility of prayers for the dead, and he made a very happy and touching reference to the life and virtues of his deceased predecessor, the learned and apostolic Bishop Rosati. At the close of this service, the second public session of the council was held, with ceremonies similar to those of the first.

The council was brought to a close by the third and last public session, held on Sunday the 17th ult. The ceremonies attending the conclusion were not less imposing than those which had accompanied the opening of the council. The concluding sermon was delivered by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Reynolds, of Charleston, on the unity of the church, and we need only say that he did not fall short of the high expectations of his friends on the occasion.

The prelates and clergy thus convened from all parts of the union—nearly sixty in number—will not soon forget the great kindness and warm hospitality which were universally extended to them by the Catholics during the week of their sojourn in the monumental city of Lord Baltimore.

On the first and last days of the council all the prelates and clergy were entertained at dinner by the Most Rev. Archbishop, and the former were so entertained throughout the entire week.

Prefixed to the present number of the Magazine will be found a lithographic print, taken from a sketch made by the skilful artist, M. Franquinet, of N. York. It represents the archbishop, bishops, theologians, and clergy in attendance at the first solemn session of the council, in the order in which they respectively sat. We may remark that the object of the sketch is merely to give such of our readers as had not an opportunity of witnessing the solemn sessions of the council an idea of the order in which the prelates, the clergy, and the several officials were arranged. It was impossible, under the circumstances, to obtain any thing like correct portraits of those who are represented in the sketch.

We subjoin, from the Catholic Herald, a list of the prelates, theologians, and officers of the council, correcting a few omissions. In the list of the prelates it will be observed that the age and birth-place of each are marked; and in that of the theologians, we may observe that the order in which their names are placed corresponds with that of their respective bishops.

Prelates assembled in Council.—The Most Rev. Archbishop of Baltimore, Samuel Eccleston, born on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, 27th June, 1801.

Right Rev. Michael Portier, bishop of Mobile, born in Montbrion, France, Sept. 7, 1795.

Right Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick, bishop of Philadelphia, born in Dublin, Ireland, 3d December, 1797.

Right Rev. Guy Ignatius Chabrat, bishop of Bolena, coadjutor of the bishop of Louisville, born in Mauriac, France, 25th December, 1787.

Right Rev. John Baptist Purcell, bishop of Cincinnati, born in Mallow, Ireland, 26th February, 1800.

Right Rev. Anthony Blanc, bishop of New Orleans, born in Sury, France, 11th October, 1792.

Right Rev. Mathias Loras, bishop of Dubuque, born in Lyons, France, 30th August, 1792.

Right Rev. John Hughes, bishop of New York, born in Clogher, Ireland, 20th June, 1798.

Right Rev. Richard Pius Miles, bishop of Nashville, born in Maryland, 17th May, 1791.

Right Rev. Celestin Rene Laurence De la Hailandiere, bishop of Vincennes, born in Combourg, 3d May, 1798.

Right Rev. John Joseph Chanche, bishop of Natchez, born in Baltimore, 4th October, 1795.

Right Rev. Richard Vincent Whelan, bishop of Richmond, born in Baltimore, 28th January, 1809.

Right Rev. Peter Paul Lefevere, bishop of Zela, administrator of Detroit, born in Roulers, W. Flanders, 30th April, 1804.

Right Rev. Peter Richard Kenrick, bishop of St. Louis, born in Dublin, Ireland, 17th August, 1806.

Right Rev. John M. Odin, bishop of Claudiopolis, vicar apostolic of Texas, born in Amberg, France, 25th February, 1801.

Right Rev. Michael O'Connor, bishop of Pittsburg, born in Cork, Ireland, 27th February, 1810.

Right Rev. Andrew Byrne, bishop of Little Rock, born in Kavan, Ireland, 5th December, 1802.

Right Rev. William Quarter, bishop of Chicago, born in King's county, Ireland, 31st January, 1806.

Right Rev. John McCloskey, bishop of Axiern, coadjutor of the bishop of New York, born in Brooklyn, 20th March, 1810.

Right Rev. Wm. Tyler, bishop of Hartford,

Connecticut, born in Derby, Vermont, 5th June, 1806.

Right Rev. Ignatius A. Reynolds, bishop of Charleston, born in Bardstown, Kentucky, 22d August, 1799.

Right Rev. John Martin Henni, bishop of Milwaukie, born in Obersaxony, Switzerland, 15th June, 1805.

Right Rev. John Fitzpatrick, bishop of Callipolis, coadjutor of the bishop of Boston, born in Boston, 15th November, 1812.

Absent on account of distance—Right Rev. F. N. Blanchet, vicar apostolic of Oregon.

On account of advanced age—Right Rev. Benedict Joseph Flaget, bishop of Louisville, born in Auvergne, France.

On account of ill health—Right Rev. Benedict Fenwick, bishop of Boston.

Theologians.—Rev. Gilbert Raymond, Rev. H. B. Coskery, Rev. Charles I. White, of the Most Rev. Archbishop; Rev. J. A. Elder, Rev. John B. Tornatore, C. M., Very Rev. Martin John Spalding, V. G., Very Rev. Edward Timothy Collins, V. G., Rev. Augustin Verot, Rev. Michael McAleer, Very Rev. Felix Varela, V. G., Rev. Charles H. J. Carter, Rev. John B. Randanne, Rev. John B. St. Germain, Rev. Henry Tappert, C. SS. R., Rev. Charles Constantine Pise, D. D., Rev. J. Melcher, Rev. James Dolan, Rev. Thomas Heyden, Very Rev. John Corry, V. G., Rev. Oliver L. Jenkins, Rev. John McCaffrey, Rev. E. McColgan, Very Rev. John Barry, V. G., Rev. John Hickey, Very Rev. Joseph Vincent Quiblier, V. G.

Heads of Religious Orders. — Very Rev. Lewis R. Deluol, S. S. S., Very Rev. James Vandevelde, S. J., Very Rev. Peter T. Verhægen, S. J., Very Rev. George A. Wilson, O. P., Very Rev. Peter Chackert, O. SS. R., Very Rev. John Timon, C. M.

Officers of the Council.—Bishops of Mobile and Natchez, *Promoters;* Rev. E. Damphoux, Rev. Francis L'Homme, *Secretaries.*

Chanters.—Rev. William D. Parsons, Mr. Hennis.

During the council various decrees, we understand, were passed by the assembled prelates, having reference chiefly to matters of local discipline, which, after they will have been submitted to the judgment of the holy see, according to the usages of a venerable antiquity, will, if approved, be published for the guidance of Catholics in this remote portion of the holy Catholic church. This necessary preliminary may serve to explain the prudent precaution adopted by our discipline, of not conducting the proceedings in presence of a promiscuous auditory, and of not hastily or prematurely speaking of the results reached in the deliberations. The sad experience of those religious denominations in our country, who carry on their discussions in public, should ere this, we think, have taught them the utility, if not the necessity, of some such prudential regulation, if they would not continue to degrade religion to the low level of merely human interests. We have known many recent cases in which the course of Protestant deliberative assemblies on this subject has been of serious injury to religion, and has, in fact, brought contempt both on its ministers and on the sacred cause itself. The secrecy which attends the deliberations of the highest and most grave legislative body of the United States—the senate—when in executive session, presents a sound precedent for the policy adopted by our church in the despatch of executive business of a much higher order, even if the former line of conduct was not actually borrowed from the latter, which is manifestly of a much older date.

The council adjourned to meet on the fourth Sunday after Easter, in the year 1849. An application to the holy see for the erection of four new sees was resolved upon, but only two new bishops were nominated. All these matters will be finally determined by the apostolic see. It may not be amiss to observe that the other measures "spoken of in some secular journals," as having been adopted by the council, are the mere creations of dreamy imaginations, or of those that love to cater for the *aures prurientes* of the community.

Chaplains in the army.—We have learned, with much pleasure, that in consequence of an application from the Hon. James Buchanan, secretary of state, the Rev. Fathers McElroy and Rey, of the Society of Jesus, have started for the scene of war in Texas, in order to afford the consolations of religion to the Catholic soldiers in the army of the United States. Two other Rev. gentlemen will also be sent from St. Louis for the same purpose. It appears that there are about eleven hundred Catholics among the regular troops. With the aid of the excellent clergymen who have been appointed to minister to their spiritual wants, we have no doubt that they will be animated to fight with increased energy and valor under the American standard.

Confirmation.—On the 2d May the Most Rev. Archbishop administered the sacrament of confirmation at Mt. St. Mary's college, and St. Joseph's academy, near Emmitsburg, Md., to about ninety persons. On Ascension day he confirmed seventy-seven at Frederick, and on the 24th May at St. Alphonsus' church, Baltimore.

New Church.—The new church which has been some time in progress of erection, near Rockville, Montgomery county, Md., will be dedicated on the second Sunday of July.

Fair.—The fair recently held in Baltimore for the benefit of St. Vincent's Male Orphan Asylum, realized a net profit of more than $2,700.

Diocess of Philadelphia.—*New Roman Catholic church at Minersville.*—The Catholics of Minersville, Pa., are about to erect a new church in that borough, 50 front by 100 deep, to be built of bricks, the present one having become too small for the congregation worshipping there.—*F. Jour.*

Fair.—The fair recently held in Philadelphia for the benefit of the congregation of St. Augustine's church, realized, clear of all expenses, the sum of $6,200.—*C. Adv.*

Diocess of New York.—*Conversion.*—On the 10th inst., after proofs of probation and due sincerity, Mrs. Marian Blackburn, a member of the church of England, abjured all its articles, and was received into the Catholic church by the Rev. R. Keleher, pastor of Florence, Oneida county, N. Y.—*F. Jour.*

Diocess of Pittsburg.—*Sisters of Mercy.*—On Tuesday, 5th May, Miss O'Brien (Sister Agatha) and Miss Goold (Sister Augusta) were received as professed Sisters of the Order of Mercy. On the same occasion, Miss Catharine M'Girr (Sister Philomena) and Miss Jane O'Gorman (Sister Augustina) were received as novices. These solemn and interesting ceremonies, at which the Rt. Rev. Bishop of the diocess, attended by Very Rev. Mr. Heyden and Rev. Mr. Deane presided, took place in the cathedral in the presence of a numerous congregation. An excellent sermon was preached by the Rev. Mr. Brady, pastor of Hollidaysburg.—*Pittsburg Catholic.*

Diocess of Cincinnati.—*Confirmation.*—The sacrament of confirmation was administered in the cathedral on last Sunday afternoon by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Purcell and Rt. Rev. Bishop Hailandiere of Vincennes, Indiana. The latter prelate, having arrived in this city on his way to the Provincial Council, officiated at vespers, and Father Timon preached an excellent sermon on the dispositions with which the sacrament of confirmation should be received. The two prelates were occupied until nearly six o'clock in administering the sacrament to *seven hundred and ninety-five persons!* Amongst those who on this occasion were enrolled under the banner of the cross, were several who last year would have looked with indifference on that holy rite of which they were the worthy recipients. Great numbers of children had made their first communion on the same day at the church of St. Francis Xavier, the convent of the Sisters of Notre Dame and at the cathedral.—*C. Tel.*

Ursuline Convent and Academy near Fayetteville, Brown county, Ohio.—The sisters and pupils of these Institutions, notwithstanding the length and severity of the last winter, we are happy to learn, enjoy excellent health. The Ursulines have already had the foundations dug, and extensive preparations made, for the building, during the ensuing summer and autumn, of one of the largest literary institutions in the west. This edifice will be one hundred and twenty feet long by sixty feet wide, and three stories high, besides basement and attic. The site is well adapted for such a purpose, and we have every reason to believe that the undertaking will be crowned by a gracious Providence with complete success.

We know of no portion of the state which we could more safely and cordially recommend to emigrants desirous of purchasing large or small farms than the neighborhood of Fayetteville. The land is sold at prices graduating, according to the value of improvements, from five to ten, and up to twenty or thirty dollars the acre. There is still, however, an abundance of excellent land to be had at the lowest of these rates. And in no part of the diocess are greater facilities afforded for spiritual instruction and care, and the education of female youth.

Sisters of Notre Dame, Toledo.—Equally favored with the foregoing are the convent and academy of Toledo. The sisters and scholars are here also blessed with excellent health, and the school under such able management continues to advance in its successful claims to public patronage and esteem. We can not sufficiently admire the heroism with which the sisters, with the humble but confident hope of being useful to religion and society, disregarded the fears of the "Maumee" fever, from which, through the divine blessing on such devotedness as theirs, they have experienced that there was nothing to be feared, and commenced an establishment which bids fair to be one of the brightest ornaments of our holy faith in this diocess. Toledo *must* become a place of great importance. Its location at

the mouth of the Maumee River, and the junction of the Miami Extension and Wabash Canal with Lake Erie, as well as the facility of access, its proximity to Detroit and Cleveland (by lake steamers), without calculating the great prospective advantages to be derived from being selected as the terminus of the railroad to be built from Buffalo along the southern shore of the lake, and also of another railroad already completed far into the interior of Michigan, must, in a short time, make it rival in magnitude and wealth any of the largest cities, at least in the west. The sisters of Notre Dame will not be forgotten in future years when the earliest and most efficient pioneers of its civilization are commemorated.—*Cath. Tel.*

Diocess of Chicago.—*Ordination.*—The Rt. Rev. Wm. Quarter held an ordination, in the cathedral of St. Mary, Chicago, on "Low Sunday," the 19th of April, when he conferred the clerical tonsure on five, and the minor orders on four students of his ecclesiastical seminary.—*Truth Teller.*

Diocess of Vincennes.—Saturday of Ember week, at an ordination held in the cathedral, by the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Vincennes—Rev. Anthony Carius was promoted to the priesthood.

The spiritual retreat for the clergy, conducted by Rev. F. Timon, commenced April 22d, and concluded on the 29th. There were present twenty-seven clergymen.

On the 26th, Rev. Ernest Audran was promoted to deaconship, and Messrs. Andrew Bennet and John Ryan were ordained subdeacons.—*Cath. Advocate.*

Diocess of New Orleans.—*Retreat.*—The spiritual retreat at New Orleans for the laity was closed in the cathedral on the 24th of April, after having been a source of abundant spiritual blessings to those engaged in it.

Retreat.—The spiritual retreat, commenced at Donaldsonville on the 19th of April, was closed on the 26th. The exercises were well attended, and produced the most salutary effects. Several remarkable conversions took place during the week. At the close of the retreat, a large bell, destined for the church of Donaldsonville, and weighing twelve hundred pounds, was blessed by the Rev. Mr. Perche. This bell, together with a clock of excellent manufacture, was presented to the church by one of the parishioners.—*Prop. Cath.*

New Church.—On the 3d of May the corner stone of a new church, under the invocation of St. Joseph, was laid by the Very Rev. S. Rousselon, at New Orleans. Rev. J. Mullon preached on the occasion.—*Prop. Cath.*

Confirmation.—On the 19th of April, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Blanc confirmed fifty-three persons at the church of St. Michael; on the 21st, in the church of St. John the Baptist, fifty-one; and on the 23d, two hundred and three in the cathedral. Total, 306.—*Prop. Cath.*

Growth of the West.—The following statistics, which have appeared in some of the political papers, and which, we suppose, must be correct, are full of instruction to Christians, as well as to the statesman. Are we to allow the great west thus fearfully to grow up, without striving to imbue it with the fear of God and the spirit of his religion? If it be so that in a few years our country is to be controlled by the west, can we be indifferent to what its religious character shall then be?

In 1840, the Atlantic states had (omitting fractions) 10,700,000 inhabitants; and the states lying west of the mountains, and between the lakes and gulf, 6,400,000. From the former must be deducted one fourth of the population of Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Georgia, and the small part of New York lying on Lake Erie, as they are decidedly western in position, interests and character. This portion amounts to about 1,000,000, making the Atlantic population, at the last census, 9,700,000; the entire western 7,400,000. From 1790 to 1830, the Atlantic portion (excluding that part of those states which properly belong to the west) increased 6,120,000 to 1,220,000 for each decennium since the first census. The increase was nearly uniform during the three first periods, being about 1,070,000; it rose in the fourth period, or from 1820 to 1830, to 1,690,000, but decreased in the fifth from this last number to 1,330,000. Assuming this to be the increase for the current decennium, we shall have at the census of 1850, a population of 10,930,000 in the Atlantic portion of the states. Allowing the increase of the whole United States to be the same as hitherto—that is, at the rate of one third for every ten years, we shall have, for our entire population in 1850, 22,760,000, from which, deducting the Atlantic portion, 10,930,000, there remain for the west 11,830,000, or a majority of 900,000. That we

are entirely within the mark in estimating the growth of the west, appears clearly from the following table:

Increase of the west from 1790 *to* 1840.

1790 to 1800,.....270,000
1800 to 1810,.....690,000
1810 to 1820,.....1,160,000
1820 to 1830,.....1,430,000
1830 to 1840,.....2,900,000

From this it will be seen that the ratio of increase has been, in two of the periods, over 100 per cent.; in one of them 70 per cent.; and in only one case has it fallen below 50 per cent.; while for the preceding ten years it exceeded 100.

To Correspondents and Readers.—The article on *Geology at variance with Scripture* contains an expression which, although meaning well according to the writer's views, will not appear accurate to those who may be unacquainted with the peculiar sense in which he uses the word *science*. The expression alluded to will be found on p. 307, where it is said that "all natural science rests on hypothesis." This proposition we consider erroneous according to the obvious and literal meaning of the words; because the word *science* in this passage is neither taken in its strictest sense, embracing that portion of philosophical knowledge which does not rest on hypothesis, but on facts or truths which are certain; nor is it taken in its general sense, which comprehends all knowledge, both that which is certain and that which is hypothetical or a mere matter of opinion. The writer employs the term in an acceptation which we think peculiar, and it is therefore necessary to state that by the word *science* he means only the speculations or the explanations of philosophers in regard to known *facts*. He discards from science the facts themselves, and allows it to imply only the theoretical inventions which philosophers bring forth in order to explain these facts. With this distinction the reader will be enabled to understand the views of the writer on geology, whose doctrine we have no right to complain of, but whose phraseology, in this particular instance, seems to us unwarranted by usage.

The following articles have been received, and will appear as soon as space will permit:

1. *What is the Bible?* a review. 2. *Those Vesper Bells*, poetry. 3. *The Jesuit Missionary*, poetry. 4. Two articles of surpassing interest, on Dr. Durbin's Observations in the East.

OBITUARY.

Died, on the 19th of May, at Baltimore, Edward Chassaing, aged 45 years.

Mr. Chassaing was a native of the West Indies, but spent the greater portion of his life in Baltimore, where he was always known as an industrious and useful citizen. His talents, which were above the common order, were not unfrequently displayed in the defence of justice and of truth, but what is perhaps more honorable to his memory in this age of selfishness, is the noble charity which he exercised towards those in want, not the less generous because sometimes veiled from the public eye. We sympathize with his excellent family in their painful bereavement, while we share also their consolation in knowing that he left this world in truly Christian sentiments, and with a lively hope of an eternal reward.

On Wednesday night, the 7th May, at Washington, D. C., Mr. Walter Clarke, in the 69th year of his age.

Of the deceased, who was one of the oldest inhabitants of our city, having resided in it for upwards of forty-six years, no sketch, however long, could do justice to his merits or satisfy the expectations of his friends and acquaintances. They will be gratified to learn that the virtues which adorned him during life, shone brighter and brighter as death approached, and proved at that awful hour the support of the expiring Christian, and the great and only consolation of his weeping family, by whom he was surrounded. Fortified by all the rites of the Catholic church, of which he was from childhood a zealous and practical member, he resigned his soul, with the utmost calmness and confidence, into the hands of his Creator, for whom alone he had lived, and in obedience to whom he cheerfully died.—*Nat. Intelligencer.*

LITERARY NOTICES.

The Library of American Biography, conducted by Jared Sparks; Vol. IX. Boston: Little and Brown. 12mo.

The biographical series which Mr. Sparks is engaged in, has already concentrated a vast amount of information, which will be referred to with profit by the reader of history. The volume before us contains the life of Leonard Calvert, the first governor of Maryland, with those of Samuel Ward and Thomas Posey. The first of these biographies was written by the Rev. Geo. W. Burnap, of Baltimore, and we take pleasure in stating, after having glanced through the narrative, that it is characterized by a general accuracy and a spirit of impartiality which reflect the highest credit upon the author. He has not aimed at the inglorious distinction, so ardently sought after by certain *philosophers* of history, of remodelling and reforming facts to suit special purposes; he has been satisfied with drawing his information from sources which have always been considered pure and genuine, and which have never fallen under the suspicion of error. Hence the life and character of Leonard Calvert, the first governor of Maryland, stand forth in Mr. Burnap's history in all the cloudless glory which universal opinion had before conceded to him. The author has ably vindicated the fame of Calvert as the founder of religious freedom on these shores, and his remarks deserve to be quoted. After citing that passage of the Maryland charter which alludes to religious matters, he continues:

"As this is the only article concerning religion in the charter, it is important to ascertain what were its meaning and intent, and how far it secures religious liberty, as it is now understood. The candid inquirer, it is believed, must admit that there is in the charter no advance upon the ideas which then prevailed in England upon this subject. The same connection between church and state is contemplated, which then existed in the mother country, just the same degree of religious freedom which was then enjoyed in the bishopric of Durham. The "license and faculty of erecting and founding churches, chapels, and places of worship," and dedicating them, was vested in the proprietary. Having the original right of soil, the proprietary might have prevented the erection of any church or chapel for the propagation of a faith which he should choose to suppress. Moreover, he had vested in him 'the patronage and advowsons of all churches which shall happen to be built.'

"By the provisions above recited, it appears that the whole control of ecclesiastical affairs is granted to the proprietary. The power over all church matters was vested in him, and was to emanate from him, and not from the people, as it does when religion is left free. The pastors were to be chosen, not by popular election, nor were the hearers to have any voice in their election, but by the appointment of the owner of the soil. The proprietary might prevent the erection of any church which he chose to forbid, and, by the exclusive power of appointment, dictate the faith of the province. The proprietary might renounce all these rights if he chose, and proclaim entire religious freedom; but there is no provision made for the exercise of that freedom in the charter. That instrument makes provision for the support of the clergy, not by the people, but by the rent of lands, or other property, bestowed upon each individual church by the proprietary, or those to whom he might convey landed estates.

"No other condition of things seems to be contemplated in the charter, than then existed in England, and there, at that time, neither religious toleration nor liberty was known. The Catholics were, at that moment, disfranchised of their religious rights, and severe laws were in force against them; and no little ingenuity is required to explain the fact that such extensive ecclesiastical powers should have been conferred by Charles, himself a Protestant, on Lord Baltimore, an avowed Catholic. It is, perhaps, still more mysterious how a Catholic could consecrate churches according to the ecclesiastical laws of the kingdom of England, when the exercise of that religion was there forbidden under severe penalties, by act of parliament. But these inquiries, though curious, are aside from our present purpose. Suffice it to have shown that, whatever liberality was afterwards manifested by Lord Baltimore, by his brother Leonard Calvert, and the colonists, no provision is made for it in the charter.

"There is, it is true, in the twenty-second section, a proviso to this effect, that if, in the interpretation of it, any doubt shall arise as to its true construction, that meaning shall be given to it which is most beneficial, profitable, and favorable to Lord Baltimore; 'provided always that no interpretation thereof be made, whereby God's holy and true Christian religion, or the allegiance due to us, our heirs and successors, may in any wise suffer by change, prejudice, or diminution.' It has been said that this proviso covers the whole ground of religious liberty, so as to tie up the hands of Lord Baltimore and his subordinates from showing any preference of one form of the Christian religion over another, and thus takes from him the credit of voluntarily establishing religious liberty in his province.

"But this seems to be giving to very vague language a meaning altogether too particular. Had the language run in this way, provided that no interpretation be given to this charter,

whereby God's true and holy Christian religion, or the free exercise thereof, shall suffer any change, prejudice, or diminution, then the proprietary would have been forbidden to make any law by which any preference should be given to one sect over another. As it stands, it merely provides that the Christian religion shall be the only recognised religion in the province; that nothing shall be done, and no law enacted, by which its interests shall be impaired. The religion of the country shall be Christian, and not pagan, Jewish or Mahometan.

"This interpretation is confirmed not only by the general expression, 'Christian religion,' but by the terms of prohibition, 'by change, prejudice, or diminution.' If we consider the Christian religion to mean the Christian religion as it was then administered in England, and the change, prejudice, or diminution, to mean any change in respect to religious freedom, so as to be less free in the colony than it was in the mother country, we then ask, what was the religious freedom enjoyed in the mother country? And the true answer is, that it was unknown. It was not practised by Charles himself and his government. It was not practised by any sect which had the control of religious affairs, under any circumstances. The Catholics were at that moment proscribed, and special license was necessary to enable the queen to enjoy the administration of its peculiar forms. The Puritans were persecuted nearly as much as the Catholics, and Charles was willing, by fire and sword, to force the forms of Episcopacy upon the church of Scotland.

"To have established the Christian religion in Maryland, on the basis of the freedom and equality of all sects, would not have been a continuation of the church or Christianity as it was, but would itself have been a change.

"Besides, without any further specification, the meaning of "God's holy and true Christian religion" might have been interpreted by any sect to suit its own purposes. Each sect then claimed, as it does now, to be the only true church, and, of course, to have the only true Christian religion. The Catholic especially, is bound, by the principles of his own religion, to consider his own church the only true one, and to reject the claims of any other to possess the true Christian religion. Had the Catholic church in England obtained the ascendancy, then the judges, before whom any violation of the charter should have been brought, if they were true to their religious principles, must have decided that the true Christian religion was the Catholic religion."

As Mr. Burnap attaches due importance to the fact, that the correspondence of the early missionaries in Maryland had been gathered from the archives in Rome, and is now possessed by the Maryland Historical Society, it would have been but just to state that this information was originally brought to this country by the Very Rev. William McSherry, S. J., and that a copy of the documents procured by him was very kindly presented to the Maryland Historical Society by Georgetown college.

The Holy Bible. Translated from the Latin Vulgate, &c. N. York: E. Dunigan. 8vo.

Between this edition of the Bible and that published by Mr. Dunigan some time since there is a vast difference in point of appearance, although the volume before us is printed neatly and in large clear type, and embellished with several engravings. It is said to be as cheap as any edition yet issued by the American Bible society. We have no doubt that, together with all other editions of the Catholic Scriptures, it will meet with a ready circulation.

Outlines of Roman History, from the foundation of the city to the fall of the Eastern empire, for families and schools: with numerous engravings. Philadelphia: Thomas, Cowperthwait & Co., and Carey & Hart. 18mo.

Outlines of Grecian History, for families and schools, &c. Philadelphia: Thomas, Cowperthwait & Co. 18mo.

Outlines of American History, for families and schools, &c. Philadelphia: Thomas, Cowperthwait & Co. 18mo.

Outlines of the History of England, &c. Philadelphia: Thomas, Cowperthwait & Co. 18mo.

The above mentioned books are excellent compendiums of the subjects which they profess to treat of, with the exception of some few objectionable passages in the histories of England and America, which are not sufficiently free from sectarian bias.

Katholische Kirchenzeitung. Baltimore: M. Œrtel, publisher and editor.

This weekly paper has just been started in Baltimore, for the benefit of the German Catholic population, and, if we may be allowed to judge of its future career from the abilities of the editor, and the eminent success which has crowned his efforts elsewhere in a similar undertaking, we have no hesitation in saying that it will prove a valuable auxiliary in the defence of religious truth, and an interesting channel of intelligence for the German Catholics of the eastern states. Such a periodical has long been a desideratum amongst us, and we trust that it will be liberally sustained.

Spiritual Maxims of St. Vincent de Paul, arranged for every day in the year. Baltimore: Printed and Published by John Murphy.

This interesting little work has been received with such great favor by the Catholics of this country, that it has already, in the course of little more than a year, gone through two editions. The name of St. Vincent de Paul is associated with so many brilliant charities; the results of his philanthropy so wide spread, and so sensibly felt, that it would be strange did we not experience an earnest desire to read whatever may have been bequeathed us by so pure a mind. This little book of maxims abounds in evidences of the author's goodness and wisdom. We wish every man would study it, and govern himself by its lessons. Mr. Murphy's edition is at a price which places it in the reach of the poorest man; the type is distinct and full, and, for a work of such trifling cost, shows much care and neatness in its execution.

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
3 8151 001 25065 0